



Anglo-American Hispanists and the Spanish Civil War

*Hispanophilia, Commitment,
and Discipline*

SEBASTIAAN FABER



ANGLO-AMERICAN HISPANISTS
AND THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR
HISPANOPHILIA, COMMITMENT, AND DISCIPLINE

Sebastiaan Faber

palgrave
macmillan



ANGLO-AMERICAN HISPANISTS AND THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR
Copyright © Sebastiaan Faber, 2008.
All rights reserved.

First published in 2008 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN™
175 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010 and
Houndsborough, Basingstoke, Hampshire, England RG21 6XS.
Companies and representatives throughout the world.

PALGRAVE MACMILLAN is the global academic imprint of the
Palgrave Macmillan division of St. Martin's Press, LLC and of
Palgrave Macmillan Ltd. Macmillan® is a registered trademark in
the United States, United Kingdom and other countries. Palgrave is
a registered trademark in the European Union and other countries.

ISBN-13: 978-0-230-60079-9
ISBN-10: 0-230-60079-4

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Faber, Sebastiaan, 1969—
Anglo-American hispanists and the Spanish Civil War :
hispanophilia, commitment, and discipline / Sebastiaan Faber.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-230-60079-4
1. Spain—History—Civil War, 1936–1939—Foreign public
opinion, American. 2. Spain—History—Civil War, 1936–1939—
Foreign public opinion, British. 3. Spain—History—Civil War,
1936–1939—Historiography. I. Title.

DP269.8.P8F33 2008
946.081'1—dc22

2007050071

A catalogue record of the book is available from the British Library.

Design by Scribe Inc.

First edition: August 2008

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in the United States of America.

To Kim, Jakob, and Maya

This page intentionally left blank

CONTENTS

Preface	vi
Acknowledgments	ix
Part I Hispanophilia, Commitment, and Discipline	
1 Introduction	3
2 Labor of Love: Hispanism as Hispanophilia	17
Part II Watching Our Tongues, Pens, and Affiliations: American Hispanism and the Spanish Civil War	
3 Politics and Professionalism: Don't Mention the War	33
4 U.S. Hispanism and the Quest for Prestige: Genealogy of a Discipline	55
5 Herbert R. Southworth: The Rebirth of the "Amateur" Hispanist	73
6 Paul Patrick Rogers: Frustrations of a Radical Hispanist	97
Part III "A Balanced and Impartial View": British Hispanism and the Spanish Civil War	
7 "An Honest Seeker after Truth": E. Allison Peers and the Illusion of Impartiality	125
8 "Spain is My Country, Revolution or No Revolution": Love and Politics in Gerald Brenan	155
9 British Hispanists and the Curse of Conservatism	183
10 Conclusion: Legitimacy and Spanish Civil War Discourse	215
Notes	227
Bibliography	249
Index	271

PREFACE

This book is about the impact of a major political event on an academic field of study. Its principal argument is that the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War and the subsequent decades of Francoist dictatorship posed a set of difficult dilemmas for foreigners who had dedicated their lives to producing scholarly knowledge about Spain, including those whose Hispanist vocation was sparked by the war itself. My second, related point is that Hispanists are generally driven not only by a commitment to disciplinary rigor (the scholarly search for truth), but also by an affective bond with Spain (Hispanophilia) and by political or ethical concerns. The war, I argue, served to bring out important tensions among these driving factors.

The very topic of this book, however, poses a set of tensions and dilemmas of its own—to begin with, the sheer size of the subject matter. Although I have limited my scope to only two countries, Great Britain and the United States, and to two generations of Hispanists—those born between 1890 and 1920—the topic is still too extensive to fully treat in one medium-sized monograph. A second problem is that of incommensurability. Hispanic studies in the United Kingdom have always been a much smaller affair than in the United States, where, even in the 1930s, Hispanism was an academic industry unto itself. Nor did American and British Hispanism evolve in quite the same way. And, to make things worse, the vague, overarching concept of Hispanism comprises at least three sets of subgroups: non-affiliated scholars and academic professionals; Peninsularists and Latin Americanists; and historians, literary critics, and linguists (with philologists somewhere in between).

My solution to these problems has been to strike a balance between the general and the specific, combining birds-eye summaries of institutional history with more close-up looks at the lives and work of four individual Hispanists: Herbert Southworth, Paul Rogers, Allison Peers, and Gerald Brenan. This selection produces complications of its

own, however. For one, none of these four Hispanists can, on the face of it, be considered truly representative of the field (which, in any case, does not really exist as such). Secondly, all four present widely different profiles and challenges. Southworth was an expatriate historian who worked outside of the university system, Peers and Rogers were academic literary Hispanists, and Brenan was a bit of both. Further, the materials available for studying the careers of these four men are even more diverse than their lives, ranging from a fully fledged archive, biography, and bibliography in the cases of Brenan and Peers, to existing, but uncatalogued, papers and a handful of books and articles in the case of Southworth, to a skeletal set of personal papers, a limited body of published texts, and a heavily redacted FBI file in the case of Rogers. The four biographical chapters inevitably reflect this diversity in terms of length as well as focus.

I am well aware that I have not been able to fully resolve these and other challenges posed by the choice of subject matter and the materials available. Nonetheless, it is my hope that these four cases, placed in a wider institutional context and viewed through the conceptual troika that guides this book—Hispanophilia, commitment, and discipline—will serve to bring out concerns and considerations that are crucial to the scholarly study of Spain, or any foreign culture for that matter, but which have not been given the attention they deserve.

A final complication is introduced, as in all scholarship, by the identity, intellectual baggage, and ideological blind spots of the author—limitations all the more embarrassing for someone who aims and claims to reveal such baggage and blind spots in his disciplinary forerunners. As a Dutch Hispanist working and partly educated in the United States, I occupy an ambiguous institutional position. Nevertheless, in my case, too, the scholarly pursuit of truth—in this instance, analyzing the history of my own field—is mediated through affective and political factors. I have long been fascinated by the Spanish Civil War—a fascination that helped determine my becoming a Hispanist, and that has since shaped much of my teaching and research. Moreover, I belong to a generation of humanistic scholars for whom cultural and historical analysis is almost automatically centered on, and driven by, political concerns in the widest sense. In this respect, my interests and concerns as a scholar of Spain, but also my views of myself and the nature of my subject, are enormously different from those of the generations of Hispanists that I study in this book.

Like my British and American predecessors, as a Dutchman, I am drawn to, and fascinated by, the Hispanic world because of its otherness—an otherness that, despite my identification with, and affection for, many things Spanish and Latin American, I will never be able fully to bridge. In the same way, my fascination with my Hispanist fore-runners is rooted in my awareness of *their* fundamental otherness—of all that makes me different from them. The initial spark for this book was curiosity: I wanted to know how Hispanists reacted to the war. Soon, curiosity was replaced by surprise, as I realized that many had reacted quite differently than I would have thought. In this study, I have tried to understand and explain these unexpected reactions, but also to subject them to a critical analysis. I hope this book will contribute to a better understanding of British and American Hispanism, although, of course, I will have to leave the final critical analysis of my own work to future institutional historians.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In the six or seven years that I have been working on this book, I have acquired more debts than I can probably ever repay—the least I can do is acknowledge them. I owe thanks to the following friends and colleagues for reading and commenting on substantial parts of the manuscript: Danny Anderson, Maarten van Delden, Simon Doubleday, Soledad Fox, Gina Herrmann, Paul Preston, and Douglass Rogers. I also owe an intellectual debt to James D. Fernández and Joan Ramon Resina, whose work on the history of U.S. Hispanism served as an inspiration. The following people have generously provided me with crucial information in the form of documents, artifacts, files, and personal memories: Federico Álvarez, María Luisa Aub and Neil Falkner, Jess Brodnax, Juan Luis Buñuel, Stanley Burnshaw, Gerald Cloud, Richard N. Current, Miguel González-Gerth, Ronald Hilton, Ann Mackenzie, Richard Lothrop, Víctor Pardo Lancina, Betty Pollack, Paul Preston, Geoffrey Ribbans, Douglass and Shirley Rogers, Donald Shaw, Helen Shepard, Bill Tallmadge, Harriet Turner, and Tita Valencia. Thanks, too, to my student assistants Marian Schlotterbeck, Hilary Carr, and Cassandra Ogren, and to Dr. Roland Baumann, Oberlin College archivist. Whatever virtues this book has are due to the generous help I have received; the many flaws that remain are my responsibility alone.

I also owe much to my colleagues at Oberlin—Ana Cara, Jed Deppman, Erik Inglis, Scott McMillin, Patrick O’Connor, Vicente Pérez de León, Ben Schiff, László Scholz, and Steve Volk—for providing a constant opportunity for the lively exchange of ideas. I am grateful to Oberlin College for several research grants and sabbatical leaves. I would also like to thank Alessandra Bastagli and Chris Chappell, my editors at Palgrave Macmillan, for their interest in and support for this project.

This book would not have been possible without the extensive assistance of librarians and archivists at the Oberlin Library and

Archives, the International Institute for Social History in Amsterdam, the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center in Austin, and the Archives of Liverpool University. The Tamiment Library and Robert F. Wagner Labor Archives at New York University generously provided the cover art. I am also indebted to all those anonymous librarians, archivists, and software developers who, over the past years, have made millions of pages of books, newspapers, and journals available in electronic format. Without them, it would have been infinitely harder to do the kind of institutional research that this book is about.

I thank the following individuals and institutions for granting me permission to quote from published and archival materials: Douglass Rogers, Liverpool University, the Harry Ransom Humanities Resource Center, the International Institute for Social History, the Estate of E. Allison Peers, and the Estate of Gerald Brenan. Some sections of this book have appeared in different form as part of other published work; I thank the editors for their kind permission to include these sections in this book. Some sections of Chapter 2 and Chapter 4 appear in an essay on economies of prestige in American Hispanism, published in a special issue of the *Hispanic Research Journal*, edited by Josep-Anton Fernàndez and Patricia D'Allemand. Part of the introduction appears in an article about the impact of the Spanish Civil War on Dutch Hispanism, published in the proceedings of a conference organized, and edited, by Hub. Hermans. Two shorter pieces, in *Literal: Latin American Voices*, edited by Rose Mary Salum, and the *Revista de Erudición y Crítica* (Madrid), edited by Pablo Jauralde, also drew on the subject matter of the first four chapters.

My deepest gratitude goes out to my wife, Kim, and our two children, Jakob and Maya, for their unflagging love and support.

P A R T I



HISPANOPHILIA, COMMITMENT,
AND DISCIPLINE

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 1



INTRODUCTION

In the July 1938 issue of *The Nineteenth Century and After*, a venerable conservative London monthly, the Spanish philosopher José Ortega y Gasset published an article in which he claimed that Albert Einstein did not know what he was talking about. To be sure, Ortega was not questioning Einstein's credentials as a physicist. He was referring specifically to a public statement the German scientist had made in support of the Spanish Republic, which had been at civil war with a faction of military rebels since the summer of 1936. For Ortega, Einstein's intervention was symptomatic of the sad state of a European intelligentsia that had been wooed into supporting a cause whose true nature they ignored. "While in Madrid the Communists and their associates forced, under grave threats, writers and University Professors to sign manifestos, to speak on the wireless, etc.," Ortega wrote, "some well-known English writers signed another manifesto in which they guaranteed that those Communists and their friends were the defenders of democratic liberty." Even Einstein "thought himself possessed of the 'right' to emit an opinion on the Spanish civil war." But Einstein, Ortega pointed out, "enjoys the most complete ignorance concerning the past, the present and the future of Spain."¹

Ortega's style is clumsy with anger and frustration, and that is no surprise. From the moment of its outbreak, the Spanish Civil War gave rise to a discourse in which passion overshadowed reason. Being detached or dispassionate, it seemed, was not an option. The war had broken out in July 1936 after a group of right-wing military officers had attempted to overthrow the democratically elected government of the Popular Front. From the outset, the armed conflict was as much an international as a domestic affair. Hitler and Mussolini supported the military rebels, while the USSR and Mexico backed the

Republican or government side. Although most Western powers decided to stay out of the conflict, the war stirred up public opinion in Europe and the Americas. For liberals and leftists, the war in Spain represented a crucial battle of democracy against fascism; more conservative sectors saw it as the struggle of civilization against Communism. Given these tremendous stakes, it seemed impossible not to support one of the two fighting factions. Indeed, everyone who was anyone had an opinion about the conflict and its implications—and if they did not have a clear position, they were pressured into one. While conservative and religious groups tended to favor Franco, most liberals and progressives—including many prominent intellectuals—publicly supported the Republic. Close to 40,000 volunteers from 53 countries—some 2,600 from the United States alone—decided to travel to Spain to participate in the war, most on the Republic's side. Nevertheless, in April 1939, the Republic surrendered, and General Franco ruled Spain as a military dictator until his death in 1975.

As is well known, the conflict's cultural impact was as significant as its military and political dimensions. The Spanish Civil War immediately captured the imagination of almost the entire Western world, and the public spheres of Europe and the Americas quickly turned into ideological battlefields on which different factions ardently disputed each other's claims to the "truth about Spain." Ironically, of course, given the very fierceness of the battle, truth was the proverbial first victim to fall. There are few chapters in Western history, in fact, in which truth has proven as singularly elusive, and as blatantly politicized, as it has in relation to the Spanish Civil War. Even now, seventy years later, historians in Spain and elsewhere disagree on almost every aspect of the conflict.²

The Spanish Civil War was also the first "media war": the first, in Susan Sontag's words, "to be witnessed ('covered') in the modern sense: by a corps of professional photographers at the lines of military engagement and in the towns under bombardment, whose work was immediately seen in newspapers and magazines in Spain and abroad."³ What was told in these countless media stories was as important as *how* it was told: from the moment of its outbreak to the present day, the discourse on the Spanish Civil War has been an intense struggle among competing narrative frameworks. Was it an international war or a purely Spanish affair? Was it a "tragedy," an epic "crusade," or a "revolution"? Were the valiant Spanish people fighting against Communism, or against Fascism? Who were the bad guys and who the heroes? All possible representational weapons were deployed in this

relentless struggle for narrative hegemony—photos, text, and film; fiction, poetry, and music; posters, montage, and propaganda; populism and pathos. The key assets in this struggle fought by hundreds of journalists, intellectuals, religious leaders, politicians, and diplomats from Spain and abroad, were legitimacy and credibility.

Legitimacy and credibility, however, was precisely what Ortega had lost. He had written his comments against Einstein some six months before they appeared in *The Nineteenth Century*—he had hoped to publish them in the *London Times* but was turned down.⁴ In fact, the philosopher was living one of the worst moments of his career. Depressed and seriously ill, he had been holed up in Paris since November 1936, defending a highly unpopular position. While most Spanish intellectuals and hundreds of their non-Spanish colleagues in the West were quick to take sides in the Spanish Civil War, Ortega, who had been, for years, one of the most powerful figures in Spanish intellectual life, emphatically refused to declare his support for either the Popular Front government or the military rebels. Together with a couple of fellow intellectuals, including Gregorio Marañón and Salvador de Madariaga, he had attempted to adopt a “neutral” third position above the two warring factions.⁵ This proclaimed neutrality—manifested through an uncharacteristic public silence—corresponded to a fundamental ambivalence in his political views. Although he had always considered himself a liberal, he was also fearful of what he called the “masses,” whose impending “revolt” he saw as the greatest threat to Western civilization. He had broken with the Republic when these masses gained an important political presence. In fact, his two sons fought with the conservative military whose attempted coup d'état in July of 1936 had unleashed the war, and some biographers have suggested that Ortega sympathized with the rebels.⁶ Even if he did, though, he was careful not to declare his sympathies publicly. The result was that Spain’s most respected intellectual authority was now ostracized by both parties.

But even though Ortega found himself marginalized, in many ways, his dilemma—if and how to deploy one’s intellectual expertise and authority in the face of political upheaval—was representative of his time. Since the late 1920s, the Western intelligentsia had been reconsidering its proper role in society in the face of economic depression and the resulting political turmoil. In the debates among intellectuals, the options were quickly reduced to two alternatives: detachment or engagement—that is, preserving one’s intellectual independence at all cost, or putting one’s talents at the service of a particular political or

social cause. The rise of fascism convinced many of the need for the latter. The outbreak of the Spanish Civil War in the summer of 1936 further helped draw doubters over to the camp of the *engagés*, forcing them to declare their support either for the Loyalists (also referred to as the Republicans) or the Rebels (who preferred to call themselves Nationalists). In this combative context, Ortega's attempt at detachment stood out like a sore thumb.

And yet, in spite of his clumsy rancor, Ortega may have had a point. To some extent, Einstein really did not know what he was talking about. And Ortega was also right to argue that Einstein was no exception. It is safe to say that most of the non-Spaniards who spoke out publicly on the Spanish Civil War—even those who went to Spain to see what was going on or to fight on either side—indeed knew very little about the country.⁷ The actual basis on which most intellectuals chose sides was, in most cases, quite limited. Moreover, the propaganda machines of both camps were successful in erasing all nuance and reducing the representation of the war to a universal battle between good and evil.⁸ Naturally, this lack of knowledge made it easier for foreign intellectuals to take sides: the simpler the political picture, the quicker it is to make up one's mind about it.

But what about the exceptions to the rule? What about the small group of individuals in the non-Spanish West who *did* know Spain, who had been there, studied its history, language, and culture—and who, moreover, were driven by a deeply felt fascination and affection for the country and its people? In other words, what about the Hispanists? Did they also feel compelled to take sides? And, if so, what side did they take and how did they express their position? What *is* the role of scholarly “experts” when their object of study becomes the center of a wide-ranging political debate—as has, say, the Middle East for the past couple of decades? How do scholars conceive of their loyalties and obligations?

Although no one disputes the tremendous importance of the Spanish Civil War for Western intellectual history, to date, curiously little has been written evaluating the impact of the war on the development of Hispanism itself. This is, in part, because the institutional development of Hispanism has only recently become a topic of scholarly research and critical debate.⁹ This book aims to contribute to this growing corpus by taking a first stab at analyzing the short- and long-term impact of the war on Hispanism in the United States and Great Britain, focusing on the generations born roughly between 1890 and 1920. *Anglo-American Hispanists* wants to be more than just an institutional

history, however. To illustrate the very concrete, but widely varying, personal dilemmas Hispanists faced in 1936 and after, I have decided to combine the institutional dimension with intellectual biography. In the course of this book, we will take a close look at the reactions to the war of two American and two British Hispanists: Paul P. Rogers and Herbert R. Southworth from the United States, and E. Allison Peers and Gerald Brenan from Great Britain. How did the war and its aftermath of repression, dictatorship, and exile affect these four men in their work and personal lives? How did they manage the sudden intrusion of politics into their field of study, at a time when an economic crisis and the rise of fascism were driving large numbers of intellectuals into political activism?

Two of these four were leftists (Rogers and Southworth), one a moderate liberal (Brenan), and one a religious conservative (Peers). Rogers and Peers were affiliated with universities; Brenan and Southworth were not, and, in fact, only became recognized experts on Spain—one might say amateur Hispanists—as a result of the war. All four of them loved Spain dearly, but in different ways and for different reasons. What exactly attracted these four foreigners to Spain? To what extent were their widely different reactions to the war shaped by the nature of their Hispanophilia? How did their affective relationship with Spain shape their scholarly work, and how did the war change their scholarship and their view of Spain and of themselves as scholars? To what extent was their work influenced by their (extra-)institutional position or their (lack of) academic affiliation? And, finally, going back to the larger institutional picture, what can be said, in more general terms, about the impact of the war and its aftermath on the discipline as a whole in the United States and the United Kingdom, not only with regard to Spain as an object of study, but to Latin America as well?

Limiting this investigation to the United States and Great Britain was necessary—one has to stop somewhere—but not arbitrary. British and American Hispanism are among the most important and prolific national subfields of the discipline. In addition, Spain functioned for both England and America at crucial historical moments as a “constitutive other” to help define themselves as nations. An exoticized, demonized representation of Spain as an empire in decline (the “Black Legend”) served to bolster both countries’ self-image as the only legitimate source of enlightened modernity. A similar process of “othering” Spain allowed for idealizing (but no less distorted) representations of Spain by oppositional movements, most notably, romanticism. The

history of American and British Hispanism reflects both these tendencies, and both reappeared in the public discourse on the Spanish Civil War in Europe and the United States.¹⁰

From my selection of four Hispanists, it is clear that I do not limit the term Hispanism to academically affiliated scholars. In fact, I am specifically interested in the way that the relations between academics and “aficionados” have helped shape Hispanist disciplinarity. Among other things, I will be arguing that the development of the discipline, even in its fully professionalized phase, has been unusually influenced by amateurs. In the 1930s, moreover, the distinction between professionals and amateurs was still quite tenuous. Even though professionalization was on the rise, especially in the United States, the interbellum Hispanist was still a jack of all trades: traveler, language teacher, textbook writer, scholar, journalist, tourist guide, and, above all, something of a self-appointed ambassador of Spanish culture. During the decades preceding the Spanish Civil War, when public interest in the country was minimal, Hispanists had considered it their mission to inform and educate their home cultures about the great nation south of the Pyrenees. In many cases, the Hispanist was simply a Hispanophile who had turned his passion into a profession.

But it is also clear that Hispanists differed widely in the motives and focus of their affection—not only why they loved Spain and its people, but what they loved in them. If, for some, Spain was the Catholic nation par excellence, an example of religious spirituality and wholesome social hierarchy, for others it was a quintessentially democratic country, whose high culture was so valuable precisely because it was suffused with the spirit of the common folk. As recent scholarship on the institutional history of Hispanism has begun to identify the different assumptions and ideologies underlying Hispanists’ representations of Spain, it has also become clear how these representations are related to the Hispanists’ own cultural or national identities, as well as larger cultural and geopolitical dimensions. As Resina and Mariscal have shown, for instance, early American Hispanism indirectly helped bolster the United States’ self-image by portraying Spain as an empire in decline.¹¹ The importance of particular national and cultural contexts complicate the notion of Hispanism as a cosmopolitan scholarly institution transcending national boundaries. Each national branch of the Hispanist community has its own particular genealogy, bound up with the history of academic institutions and intellectual life in their respective national communities.

To complicate things further, “Hispanism” and “Hispanist” are notoriously slippery concepts. Although the term Hispanism was initially invented by Spaniards to designate foreigners interested in their country, over time, *hispanismo* and *hispanista* have become multilayered concepts burdened with significant ideological baggage. *Hispanismo* not only signifies the amateur interest in, and love for, Spain (that is, a form of Hispanophilia), but also the professionalized, interdisciplinary academic field devoted to studying Spanish language, culture, and history.¹² At the same time, *hispanismo* is regularly used as a synonym for Pan-Hispanism—that is, the movement or ideology that presumes, celebrates, or promotes the cultural (if not political and economic) unity of the Spanish-speaking world. Correspondingly, the term *hispanista* has been used to refer not only to an amateur Hispanophile or a professionalized expert of Spain abroad, but also to someone who believes that the cultural makeup of the wider Spanish-speaking world is, and should be, rooted in Castile.

The concept of Hispanism, then, can be used like Said’s notion of Orientalism as the whole of the discourse on Spain—academic and nonacademic, textual and visual. And, like Orientalism, Hispanist discourse carries an unmistakably imperialist charge. But while Said constructs Orientalism largely as the discursive manifestation of, and instrument for, the Western domination and control of the East, the case of Hispanism is more complicated. On the one hand, Hispanist discourse, as formulated by the great powers (including the United States, the Netherlands, England, Germany, and France), deploys a “soft” kind of imperialism vis-à-vis a politically marginalized Spain that, like the Orient, is constructed as exotic, backward, passionate, violent, and so on. On the other hand, however, Hispanist discourse within the Spanish-speaking world exercises a residual, but still powerful, Castilian imperialism vis-à-vis other Iberian nationalities (Catalonia, the Basque Country, Galicia), as well as Latin America.

* * *

The main question that guides this book is a simple one: How did foreign Hispanists react to the outbreak of a civil war in their country of expertise? Anecdotal evidence suggests that they were deeply affected by the war, and expectedly so. Most considered themselves lovers and admirers of the country, and many had close Spanish friends and acquaintances. Still, the war posed a series of dilemmas, particularly for academic Hispanists. Should they pronounce themselves in public about the war at all? And, if so, should they aspire to any kind of

scholarly objectivity—that is, should they attempt to be disinterested or neutral? Or should they allow their political, moral, or religious values to prevail and take sides, or even go to Spain to express their support and solidarity? How *does* one express one's profound love for a foreign nation that is violently tearing itself apart, while one's own government stands by and does nothing?¹³

In the fierce international propaganda war that accompanied the military conflict from the outset, both Republican and Nationalist intellectuals naturally appealed to their foreign friends and colleagues for support. The Hispanists' work, after all, manifested their deep interest in, and affection for, Spain. How could they fail to stand by their Spanish friends in this time of need? Both camps were convinced that only they represented the "true" Spain, and both readily assumed that Spain's foreign associates would be on their side. Thus, in June 1937, the *Heraldo de Aragón*, a newspaper published in Nationalist-controlled Zaragoza, published an open letter by Miguel Artigas to the "Hispanists of the world."¹⁴ Artigas, who, until the outbreak of the war, had been the director of the National Library, ended up choosing the Rebels' side. His letter decried the destruction of Spain's cultural heritage—museums, archives, and libraries—in the cities and villages occupied by the Republicans. At the end of his text, Artigas explicitly called upon the international community of Hispanists, naming twelve prominent Hispanists by name, to support the "true" (that is, Nationalist) Spain.¹⁵

As soon as the Republican authorities found out about Artigas' letter, they retorted in kind. The Junta Central del Tesoro Artístico, the Republican government institution charged with the safekeeping of Spain's cultural patrimony, published a pamphlet arguing that it was not the Republicans who had destroyed museums, libraries, and archives, but the bombings perpetrated by the Nationalists and their German and Italian allies. Not only had the government and its supporters done their utmost to safeguard Spain's cultural heritage—they had, in effect, *rescued* that heritage from the greedy, philistine, and protective hands of the church and nobility. In that sense, they had done international Hispanism a tremendous service.¹⁶ Tomás Navarro Tomás, Artigas' successor as director of the National Library, reaffirmed this argument in an open letter of his own.¹⁷

Foreign Hispanists were quite hesitant to heed these calls, however. In the United States, especially, they largely abstained from joining the passionate and widespread public debates about the Civil War. The field's leading journal in the United States, *Hispania*, all but

excluded the war as a subject. While hundreds of intellectuals—including many academics—took sides, wrote opinion pieces, spoke at rallies, traveled to Spain, and joined one or more of the many organizations founded to help one of the two camps, hardly any Hispanist did—although there were some important exceptions, as we will see. In Great Britain, the situation was different. Allison Peers, one of the three most prominent Hispanists of the country, quickly emerged as a leading voice in the public debate on Spain. While he saw and presented himself as an objective observer, he was rightly considered one of the most authoritative defenders of the Nationalist cause. Peers' most well-known colleagues, William Entwistle and John B. Trend, kept a much lower public profile, although it was clear that Trend sympathized with the Republic and that Entwistle was sympathetic to the Nationalists. Meanwhile, younger Hispanists such as Alexander Parker and William Atkinson also joined the fray, and they, too, were more distrustful of the Loyalists than of the military rebels.

* * *

As I indicated earlier, over the past decade, a number of scholars have written important critical assessments of the institutional history of Hispanism. Among other issues, these studies have addressed the discipline's ideological basis, its role in the construction of nationalisms, and its position in relation to other humanistic fields of inquiry. One aspect that has not received much attention yet, however, is the personal tensions that may result from the Hispanists' intellectual practice as experts of a culture other than their own—tensions connected with notions of loyalty, allegiance, commitment, and identity. I suggest that the Spanish Civil War provides an excellent opportunity to think through these tensions. In this book, I want to focus specifically on the potential conflicts among three particular clusters of emotional and intellectual imperatives that I believe are operative in a field like Hispanism: first, the *disciplinary* demands of scholarly practice (objectivity, disinterestedness, commitment to truth, as well as the self-limiting dimensions of scholarly specialization); second, scholars' own *moral and political* convictions (their commitment to certain social, religious, or ethical values; their affiliation with political parties, religious faiths, or social institutions); and third, scholars' *affective* relationship to their object of study—their Hispanophilia or love for Spain and its people.

In a sense, these kinds of tensions were typical of the 1930s. On the one hand, as we have seen, it was a time when it seemed possible, or

even inevitable, to combine intellectual work with political activism, especially antifascism or anticomunism. On the other, as Eric Hobsbawm has written, the thirties were exceptional because “the lines of loyalty” tended to run “not between but across countries.” “Never,” Hobsbawm writes, “has there been a period when patriotism, in the sense of automatic loyalty to a citizen’s national government, counted for less.”¹⁸ This was true for the pacifist Oxford students who, in 1933, pledged emphatically *not* to fight for “king and country,” and for the Communist Cambridge students who felt it their duty to spy for the Soviet Union. But it was also true for the almost forty thousand foreign volunteers who risked losing their citizenship by fighting for the Spanish Republic. In this context, what did it mean to be a Hispanophile during the Spanish Civil War? Where did Hispanists’ loyalties lie? Can we think of the Hispanophile’s love of Spain as a nationalism of sorts? And, if so, in what sense, exactly? By subtitling this book “Hispanophilia, Commitment, and Discipline,” I wish to call attention to these three competing elements. Chapter 2 will address some of the complicated history and dimensions of Hispanophilia; here, I want to say a few words about the notions of commitment and discipline.

In an enlightening essay on loyalty conflicts in exile, Judith Shklar defines commitment as “a voluntary engagement to do something in the future” which, in a political context, “usually impl[ies] the intention to support a party, a political agent, a public cause, or a political ideology.” Commitments, she adds, “are meant to be enduring, and they imply choice.”¹⁹ My use of the term refers, in the first place, to the notion of political engagement as it was conceived of by intellectuals in the 1930s: the belief that intellectual work—art, literature, scholarship—should not be done in a vacuum, but in relation and response to wider social concerns, and that this social dimension is an intrinsic part of the intellectual vocation. But I also use commitment in a wider sense to refer to the scholar as a citizen with a particular political, ethical, or religious position in life.

The concept of discipline, on the other hand, refers, in the first place, to Hispanic studies as a field of scholarly inquiry, a “historically specific [form] of knowledge production, having certain organizational characteristics, making use of certain practices, and existing in a particular institutional environment.”²⁰ By extension, “discipline” signifies the set of rules that govern—and, as such, help constitute—Hispanism as a discourse of academic expertise on a particular subject, endowed with a particular kind of legitimacy and authority. As we will

see, the outbreak of the Civil War forced Hispanists to think through, and to more clearly define, the limits of their disciplinary discourse, the nature of their expertise, and the potential impact their public conduct might have on the prestige of their field.

I would argue that the field's more strictly disciplinary dimension, in a Foucauldian sense, rests on the three pillars of rigor, specialization, and institutionality. Let me briefly define these notions. Scholarly rigor is a positivistic and prescriptive concept: in its most basic sense, the imperative of rigor demands that scholarly inquiry be conducted, and its results presented, with the maximum objectivity, precision, and honesty.²¹ Rigor, in this sense, is opposed to sloppiness, deception, and subjective bias. The notion of specialization is closely connected to rigor: the modern, disciplinary organization and production of knowledge assume that a single individual can only attain true scholarly precision and expertise if she clearly *limits* her field of inquiry. Institutionality, finally, provides the collective framework for rigor and specialization: it provides scholars with the space, means, and authority to conduct their inquiry. Moreover, its collective nature sets up the context within which specialization makes sense: individual scholars dedicating themselves to a minute aspect of reality can do so in the confidence that their colleagues will cover the rest. More important, institutionality provides the infrastructure for socialization, for disciplinarity in Foucault's sense of producing a docile, normalized, and self-perpetuating social body. Academic institutions—departments, universities, journals, professional organizations—provide not only the initial training and induction of the scholarly subject into the academic community, but they also function as permanent bodies of surveillance that can reward, as much as punish, the individual scholar's adherence to, or transgression of, the changing rules of the discipline. As such, institutions are crucial for what Pierre Bourdieu refers to as the “reproduction of the corps.”²²

Today's notion of the academic discipline reflects the multiple etymologies of the concept. On the one hand, as Shumway and Dionne note, “divisions of knowledge have been called ‘disciplines’ since Chaucer’s era”,²³ on the other, as Moran writes, discipline refers to “the maintenance of order and control amongst subordinated groups such as soldiers, prison inmates or school pupils.” In a pedagogical context, these two meanings have historically overlapped, as discipline “suggested a particular kind of moral training aimed at teaching proper conduct, order and self-control.”²⁴ Discipline in a wider sense, of course, is related to notions of abstention, abnegation, repression,

self-control, or mortification. These associations are apposite for the academic world to the extent that scholarly rigor and specialization both imply a renunciation of, respectively, the scholar's subjectivity and her possible desire to study and comprehend phenomena that fall outside of, or transcend, her narrow field of "official" expertise. Finally, since the establishment of modern academic disciplines in the late nineteenth century, disciplinarity has become a key factor in the struggle for prestige. The institutional history of modern language study has been particularly marked by this struggle, as English, French, German, and especially Spanish—long considered "easy" to learn—had to prove that they, too, could provide students with the kind of "mental discipline" that the classics were thought to provide.²⁵

In the more immediate context of Hispanism and the Spanish Civil War, the notion of discipline also resonates in the representation of the Republican period (1931–36) and the war years (1936–39) as the epitome of social chaos, marked by a pervasive lack of social discipline. This chaos was, in turn, frequently linked to the cultural stereotype of the Spanish people as ruled by their passions, "incapable" of discipline unless governed by an iron hand, and therefore unfit for modern democracy. One of the Nationalists' points of pride was precisely their ability to impose strict order and discipline in the territory they controlled. In the Loyalist camp, discipline also became highly valued as an indispensable element for winning the war; and it was mainly the discipline, dedication, and organizational skills of the Communist party leadership and its cadres that accounted for the sharp increase in party membership.

In the context of this book, Hispanophilia, commitment, and discipline bleed into and feed off each other. The scholar's affective relationship to his object of study helps provide the drive and energy necessary for the kind of lifelong dedication that academic disciplines demand. Similarly, a scholar's adherence to the rules of his discipline is a form of commitment in the same way that political or social commitment requires its dose of discipline or obedience (hence, *Parteidisziplin*). This book is as much about the politics of discipline as it is about the discipline of politics—and about the affective dimension of disciplinary commitment.

In more general terms, there is a clear tension in humanistic and social-scientific scholarly practice between the affective, the objective, and the ethical or political impulse. The nature of this tension has changed as our conception of scholarship has evolved. During the

period that is the focus of this book—from the 1930s until roughly the late 1960s—the dominant view was that scholarly objectivity should not be tainted by political, ethical, or affective factors, which were all seen as excessively subjective.²⁶ Over the past forty years, the impact of critical theory, together with different emancipatory movements and changes in the university population, have significantly complicated—though far from resolved—the relationship between rigorous scholarship, on the one hand, and affection and politics on the other.

The Spanish Civil War broke out at a moment when Hispanism, just barely professionalized, was in the midst of defining itself as a legitimate academic field, of determining the limits to its object of study, its methods, and its scholarly standards. In a sense, the outbreak of the war forced the Hispanist establishment to accelerate this process. Did Spanish current events fall within the field's academic purview? Was it possible to approach the Civil War with the kind of rigor and objectivity that characterized true scholarship? Should the channels of disciplinary communication—journals and conferences—be opened up to discourse about the Civil War? Would Hispanists' participation in the passionate public debates hurt or enhance the discipline's reputation? As we will see, British and American Hispanism answered these questions quite differently.

Before entering into a longer reflection on the role of Hispanophilia in the development of Hispanism as a discipline, let me briefly introduce the four Hispanists who will be accompanying us through the pages that follow. Paul Patrick Rogers (1900–1989) was a specialist in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Spanish literature and a well-known textbook writer who taught at Oberlin College from 1929 to 1966. Radicalized by the Depression, he became a left-leaning political activist in the early 1930s. In the summer of 1937 he spent a month in wartime Spain as a guest of the Republican government; a 145-page handwritten diary of his trip has been preserved. Soon after, however, he stopped talking and writing about the war, and became the target of an extensive FBI investigation. He did not publicly revisit his trip to Spain until the late 1970s. Herbert Rutledge Southworth (1908–99) was a socialist librarian who began writing articles on Spain when the Civil War broke out. The Republic's defeat affected him so deeply that the war turned into a life-long obsession. After spending two decades assembling the largest private library on the Civil War in the world, in the 1960s he began publishing studies that painstakingly, but irrefutably, exposed the fabrications of Francoist

historiography. Edgar Allison Peers (1891–1952) was one of the founding fathers of British Hispanism and an expert in romanticism and mysticism. Religious and conservative, he sympathized with the military rebels, but later became disenchanted with Franco. As one of the most authoritative public spokesmen on the topic, he published seven books and some fifty articles on current Spanish events. Gerald Brenan (1894–1987), a writer associated with Bloomsbury, lived in Spain in the 1920s and 1930s. Strongly affected by the Civil War, he decided to study its root causes. His *The Spanish Labyrinth* (1943) is still widely read, as are his three other books on Spain. Although a sympathizer of the Republic, Brenan later softened his criticism of Franco.

Why did I pick these four and not others? Although they were all relatively prominent in their field, I cannot claim that they are necessarily representative of the discipline as a whole. Nor do they make for a particularly balanced lot. Although they roughly belong to the same generation, their lives and work differ widely. Moreover, the materials they have left us to work with are quite uneven. Allison Peers left a voluminous production of scholarly books, essays, reviews, and newspaper articles, in addition to an archive of personal papers. Since then, significant biographical spadework has been done by Ann Mackenzie and Adrian Allan. Gerald Brenan, too, left plenty of books and articles, in addition to an extensive archive; he is also the subject of an excellent biography by Jonathan Gathorne-Hardy. Herbert Southworth's materials are less abundant: four books, several dozen articles, and some correspondence (his papers are kept in Guernica, Basque Country, and have not yet been catalogued); Paul Preston gives a brief, but very useful, account of his life and work.²⁷ The scantiest in terms of materials to work with is Paul Rogers, who, with the exception of his 1937 diary, left very few papers to supplement his publication record—which, in turn, is almost completely silent on the Civil War. I will argue, however, that it is precisely this silence that provides the key to understanding his dilemmas as a leftist Hispanist in Cold War America. For all their unevenness, then, I hope that these four life stories, when carefully read in their institutional context, will serve as useful and intriguing illustrations of the tensions and contradictions underlying the history of Hispanism as an academic discipline in the United States and Great Britain, and of the role of the Spanish Civil War in the evolution of that discipline.

C H A P T E R 2



LABOR OF LOVE HISPANISM AS HISPANOPHILIA

So why did you decide to study Spanish? My students ask me almost every semester. I am pretty sure that they do not pose the question to my American colleagues in the department, and that they would not think twice about it if I were an expert in Dutch literature. The legitimacy of their own interest in Spanish is something my American students rarely question; but, somehow, the fact that a Dutchman would share that interest strikes them as funny. There is no suspicion in their curiosity, as there generally is not, either, when Spaniards wonder about the same thing. Many people just have a hard time comprehending why a foreigner would be more interested in their business—their language, literature, history, and politics—than they are themselves.

Robert Jordan, the Spanish professor from Montana who stars in *For Whom the Bell Tolls* (1940), Ernest Hemingway's well-known novel on the Spanish Civil War, is subjected to a similar interrogation. But he does face a significant dose of suspicion. In a conversation with a group of Spanish peasant fighters in the Guadarrama Mountains, where Jordan is preparing to blow up a bridge, one of the guerrillas asks him how he ended up in Spain. "I first came twelve years ago," Jordan answers, "to study the country and the language. I teach Spanish in a university." "But why Spanish?" another Spaniard asks. "Would it not be easier to teach English since you are English?" (Although Jordan is American, the Spaniards call him *El inglés*.) An interesting discussion ensues:

“He speaks Spanish as we do,” Anselmo said. “Why should he not teach Spanish?”

“Yes. But it is, in a way, presumptuous for a foreigner to teach Spanish,” Fernando said. “I mean nothing against you, Don Roberto . . .”

“Surely you know English better,” Fernando said. “Would it not be better and easier and clearer to teach English?”

“He doesn’t teach it to Spaniards—” Pilar started to intervene.

“I should hope not,” Fernando said.

“Let me finish, you mule,” Pilar said to him. “He teaches Spanish to Americans, North Americans.”

“Can they not speak Spanish?” Fernando asked. “South Americans can.”

“Mule,” Pilar said. “He teaches Spanish to North Americans who speak English.”

“Still and all I think it would be easier for him to teach English if that is what he speaks,” Fernando said.¹

Hemingway wants us to laugh at Fernando’s naïveté. But perhaps he and my students are right. Perhaps there *is* something inherently strange, even suspicious, about people who profess a love for a culture other than their own to the point of dedicating their lives to its study.² I, for one, know much more about Spain than about Holland. That strikes even me as a bit odd. Do I love Spain more than my own country? I am not sure. But there is no denying that I am a staunch Hispanophile.

I am interested in the relation between Hispanophilia and Hispanism—especially as practiced by scholars not from Spain or Latin America—and, more generally, in the link between affection and the production, institutionalization, and legitimization of knowledge. What impels people to study a nation or culture other than their own? How does the love or fascination that attracts them to the other culture translate into a scholarly interest? To what extent is someone’s love for another culture founded on, or mediated by, knowledge of that culture? Or, inversely, to what extent does this love spur someone to *become* knowledgeable of that culture, and to share that knowledge publicly with others through teaching and published scholarship? How many foreign Hispanists started out as

love-struck Hispanophiles, and what does that mean for the history and current state of the discipline?

In what follows, I can only begin exploring these questions. After a brief reflection on Hispano- and other *philias* and their possible relationship to knowledge and expertise, we will see how academics' affective relationship to their object of study can enter into tension with scholarly imperatives of objectivity and disinterestedness. In the case of Hispanism, Hispanophilia is not the only "non-scholarly" factor drawing foreign scholars to the Hispanic world; also important are politics, ethics, and economics. Still, those who have told the history of Hispanism as an academic discipline have tended to undervalue the importance of these non-scholarly drivers. In the narratives mapping the field's history, its evolution has generally been told as a gradual triumph of professional scholarly rigor over ideology and amateurism. There are reasons to question this narrative, however, and to wonder to what extent non-scholarly factors continue to drive Hispanist scholarship.

One caveat before we proceed: so far, I have been speaking of Hispanism as a discipline concerned with both Spain and Latin America. As I indicated in the introduction, this definition of the field is as problematic as the terminology is confusing. It is not really clear what the dividing lines are between Hispanism, Latin Americanism, Peninsular studies (including Catalan, Basque, Galician, and Portuguese studies), and Latin American studies (including Brazil and the Caribbean). Most of my argument here concentrates on experts of Spain. However, even though the relationship of the great Western powers with Spain is, in many ways, quite different from their relationship with Latin America, I do think that my argument about the importance of Hispanophilia or "Latinophilia" to the formation of the field applies to both hemispheric branches of Hispanic studies.

THEORIZING PHILIAS

How does one theorize Hispanophilia? While we know a tremendous amount about people's affective relationship to their own culture, language, and nation, the literature on cultural *philias* is, by comparison, surprisingly meager. A useful first step was made by George Orwell, who suggested in 1945 that we conceive of *philias* as a form of nationalism, widely defined as any partisan affiliation that precedes, and

overrides, reason and morality: “the habit of identifying oneself with a single nation or other unit, placing it beyond good and evil and recognizing no other duty than that of advancing its interests.” This means that an English communist who “looks upon the USSR as his Fatherland and feels it his duty to justify Russian policy and advance Russian interests at all costs,” is a nationalist. The same goes for a militant English Catholic like G. K. Chesterton, who “chose to suppress both his sensibilities and his intellectual honesty in the cause of Roman Catholic propaganda,” which, in turn, led him to “an ignorant idealization of the Latin countries, especially France.”³

Orwell, like Hemingway’s Fernando, thinks that these love affairs with other cultures and nations are rather strange and suspect. He points out that certain English intellectuals are tempted by their philias to embrace political values, such as fascism, that they would have never endorsed in their own country. Thus, Chesterton’s “almost mystical belief in the virtues of democracy” within an English context “did not prevent him from admiring Mussolini”: “Mussolini had destroyed the representative government and the freedom of the press for which Chesterton had struggled so hard at home, but Mussolini was an Italian and had made Italy strong, and that settled the matter.”⁴ Chesterton’s “hold on reality, his literary taste, and even to some extent his moral sense, were dislocated as soon as his nationalistic loyalties were involved.” Orwell concludes that the affective, irrational identification with a foreign national cause is a dangerous form of transference that allows an intellectual to be “much *more* nationalistic—more vulgar, more silly, more malignant, more dishonest—than he could ever be on behalf of his native country, or any unit of which he had real knowledge” (872).

For Orwell, philias are based on a *lack* of real knowledge of the idealized foreign culture. It is true that Anglophilia, Francophilia, Sinophilia, and so on are often fed by stereotypes, romanticizations, and other forms of distortion.⁵ The same goes for Hispanophilia. The most well-known nineteenth-century accounts of Spain by Hispanophiles like Richard Ford, Washington Irving, William Prescott, and Henry Longfellow are full of untruths and exaggerations, as many have pointed out.⁶ For Tom Burns, Richard Ford’s phobias “toward certain totems of Spanish religion and politics,” his Protestant prejudices and superiority complex, as well as his romanticizing tendencies, hopelessly distorted his view of the country.⁷ Burns argues that, in the

end, Ford never took Spain seriously. Similar charges have been made against Gautier, Irving, Prescott, Ticknor, and Longfellow.⁸

But how, then, do we account for the fact that these same Hispanophiles are also considered the first foreign *Hispanists*—that is, the first recognized experts on things Spanish? Gerald Brenan, a resolute Hispanophile himself, thought that Ford's 1845 *Handbook* was the best work on Spain written since the eighteenth century,⁹ and Ian Robertson believes that many of Ford's critical observations are still “unerringly accurate.”¹⁰ Prescott's work, in Kagan's view, was largely based on “a series of assumptions and presuppositions about the inherent backwardness of Spanish culture,” while Ticknor and Lowell held a “romantic view of Spain and its people.”¹¹ But the latter three are also the founding fathers of American Hispanist historiography and literary studies. Historically, then, Hispanophilia lies at the origin of Hispanism as an academic field, at least as practiced by non-Spaniards.¹² And, in the same way that a developing human embryo quickly speeds through the stages of the species' evolution, it is probably also true that many a foreign Hispanist's individual career, mirroring the evolution of the discipline, originated in a love of the Hispanic world that was less based on knowledge than on fancy. But is Hispanophilia just the infantile, nineteenth-century stage of the academic field and its practitioners, or has it played a more sustaining role?

Here, I will argue that the history of our discipline cannot be written without taking into account the affective component that draws foreign Hispanists to their object of study, and that Hispanophilia, together with other non-scholarly factors, has played a substantial role in the formation and evolution of our scholarly field.¹³ This brings up two additional questions that will return in the chapters that follow. First, is there any correlation between the characteristics of someone's Hispanophilia and his scholarship, in particular the image of Spain that this scholarship helps in producing? Second, if Hispanophilia can be seen as a form of adopted nationalism, what exactly is the relationship between the affection, dedication, and loyalty reserved for Spain and its people, and the Hispanist's patriotic loyalty and affection for his own nation? Many times, Hispanists seem to have been concerned not only with teaching their audiences about the Spanish-speaking world, but also with singing its praise, pointing out its “greatness” or, at least, its charm and uniqueness. What does that say about the implied image of their own cultures?

The tension between philias and patriotism becomes especially pronounced, of course, in situations of international conflict and war, when a lack of loyalty becomes a national liability. It is instructive, in this regard, to recall the fate of German language teaching during World War I. Before the war, German was the most-taught foreign language in the United States, followed by French. Soon after 1914, however, enrollments plummeted, and some local governments even forbade German instruction.¹⁴ As James Fernández has shown, the leadership of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish, founded in 1917, took shameless advantage of German's sudden unpopularity to promote Spanish as a more useful and less dangerous alternative.¹⁵ Indeed, Spanish enrollments soon soared beyond expectation, as did those in French. In a talk at the July 1918 meeting of the National Education Association, AATS president Lawrence Wilkins said: "The American people of today and of many generations to come will be in no mood to listen to pleas that German be taught. . . . We have had far too much teaching of German in our schools. It was fast becoming the second language of our nation. And I personally believe that it was taught chiefly for the purpose of furthering propaganda originating in Berlin."¹⁶ But Wilkins also emphasized that students' and teachers' affection for Spanish-speaking cultures should never come at the expense of patriotism: "We do not wish our young people to become so saturated with Spanish culture that they will prefer it to that of their own country."¹⁷

These concerns about the potential links between foreign-language enrollments and international politics, between teaching and propaganda, and between knowledge of other cultures and (excessive) love of foreign nations all returned with a vengeance in the 1930s and '40s, as developments in Europe again confronted American foreign language teachers with a difficult set of problems. The memory of German's fate twenty years earlier was still fresh enough to serve as a warning for the profession. Contrary to the years of World War I, though, now the languages recognized that their fates were intricately linked. AATS president Hespelt urged the languages to "present a united front," rejecting "the tendency to identify support of the teaching of a language with approval of the current political set-up of the country where that language [is] spoken."¹⁸

In early 1936, F. Dewey Amner warned in the *Modern Language Journal* against the attempts of European governments to attract American tourists and students by "advertising" on behalf of their

own nations and denigrating others. The problem, Amner wrote, was that the student who spends significant time in a European country “generally absorbs so much of the country’s culture that he tends to absorb its vices: i.e., national prejudices, inherited from the past.” The same goes for teachers, “whose duty it is to identify themselves with foreign cultures” and who are, thus, “of all people most susceptible” to adopting European prejudices. These same prejudices easily penetrate American academia, so that “[l]anguage teachers and departments in a very real sense become the puppets of foreign nationalism in a clear attempt to carry the struggle into American education.” In short, “our opinions of foreign national cultures and their relative place in the American curriculum are based in part upon the amount and the skill of their governmental advertising applied to our educational system.”¹⁹ To counteract these dangerous tendencies, Amner proposed that American students be exposed to a *range* of foreign cultures in a strictly comparative framework.²⁰ In 1944, Robert Herndon Fife, the outgoing president of the Modern Language Association of America (MLA), made a similar plea as he outlined the road to a truly American culture of scholarship. American scholars, he said, should become more serious about learning foreign languages—in part to decrease their continued dependence on England and English, but also to avoid becoming “unwittingly propagandists for foreign *mores* in the spiritual world”: “it is of prime importance to avoid entanglement in a single foreign culture, European or other. The way to freedom is in broadening the bases for our ideas.”²¹

HISPANOPHILIA, POLITICS, AND SCHOLARSHIP

Many Hispanists may begin their careers as Hispanophiles, but Hemingway never made it beyond the first stage. By turning his hero into an academic, however, he brings out a series of interesting tensions. It is not only the fact that Robert Jordan teaches Spanish that strikes the Spaniards as presumptuous—they also think it is presumptuous for Jordan, a non-Spaniard, to come to Spain and to give them orders, fighting a war that is not even his: “What right have you, a foreigner, to come to me and tell me what I must do?” the guerrilla leader asks him early on in the novel. “That I am a foreigner is not my fault,” Jordan retorts, “I would rather have been born here.”²² Although Jordan, too, has occasional doubts about the legitimacy of his presence

on the Spanish battlefield, in the end he sees his job and presence in Spain not only as an expression of his love for Spain, but also of his commitment to the Republican cause: “He fought now in this war because it had started in a country that he loved and he believed in the Republic and if it were destroyed life would be unbearable for all those people who believed in it.”²³

The kind of ethical, moral, or political sentiment—in a word, the solidarity—that has drawn Jordan to Civil War Spain might well be, after Hispanophilia, the second most important non-scholarly factor driving the institutional history and practice of academic Hispanism.²⁴ In the context of the Civil War, especially, it is not always easy to see where Hispanophilia ends and political sentiment starts. This is true for other historical moments as well. As Tom Burns has argued, British intellectuals’ nineteenth-century fascination with Spain was largely due to their view of the Peninsular War of 1808–14 as a freedom struggle: “Spain ceased being the redoubt par excellence of reaction and clerical obscurantism and, in the aroused minds of certain opinion makers like Shelley, turned into a shining tower that spread the fire of liberty.”²⁵ Similarly, Stimson shows that American interest for Spain and Latin America in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was closely bound up with sentiments of “nationalism and patriotism,” as American intellectuals identified the Latin American struggle for independence with their own.²⁶ A similar dynamic was at work in the twentieth-century fascination with Latin America among both progressive and conservative Anglo-Americans—Cuba in the 1960s, Chile in the 1970s, and Nicaragua in the 1980s. Besides Hispanophilia and politics there have been, of course, other non-scholarly elements at play in the formation of Hispanism. Economics has been an important drawing factor,²⁷ as have, in a more general way, imperialist or larger geopolitical motives. Here, however, I will focus on the affective and political or moral dimensions.

My critical reflection on the history of a humanistic discipline concerned with other cultures is, like most of its kind, indebted to Edward Said’s *Orientalism*—and not only because Spain was long seen as the most Oriental of European nations. What my project shares with Said’s is a basic suspicion of scholarly claims to disinterestedness. Scholarship, particularly in the humanities, is never as innocent as it hopes or pretends to be, and the knowledge it produces is never devoid of a political dimension. As Said writes, “No one has ever devised a method for detaching the scholar from the circumstances of

life, from the fact of his involvement (conscious or unconscious) with a class, a set of beliefs, a social position, or from the mere activity of being a member of society.”²⁸ As is well known, for Said, Western scholars of the Orient were less driven by affection and fascination for their object of study than by condescension, hostility, and a desire for domination. Moreover, Said argues that the discourse of Orientalism—constituted by artists, intellectuals, and writers as much as scholars, politicians, and state institutions—helped construct the Orient as a distinct entity, which, in turn, made possible the continued domination of the East by the West. Orientalist scholars, therefore, however erudite and unworldly, have always been, in some way, complicit with the imperialist enterprise.²⁹ “Orientalism,” Said writes, “was ultimately a political vision of reality whose structure promoted the difference between the familiar (Europe, the West, ‘us’) and the strange (the Orient, the East, ‘them’).”³⁰ Critics of Said, most prominently Bernard Lewis and, more recently, Robert Irwin, have charged him not only with oversimplification, but also with ignoring the tremendous scholarly spadework done by academic Orientalists, as well as the genuine affection and interest driving them.³¹

British and American Hispanists were not devoid of the superiority complex that Said identifies as a key trait of academic Orientalism; but I would argue that, overall, their attitude vis-à-vis Spain and the Spaniards was much less negative than Said’s characterization of the Orientalists’ stance. Still, foreign Hispanism was institutionally invested in the notion of Spain as fundamentally “other.” It was this cultural difference that sparked scholars’ fascination, affection, and desire for knowledge. The relationship between Hispanists and their object of study was a complex interplay of love and admiration, identification, incomprehension, and frustration, as well as, at times, disdain. Although in this book I do not focus primarily on the ways that Hispanist knowledge production has been put at the service of defining, subordinating, disciplining, and colonizing the Hispanic other, this colonizing dimension is certainly present in the history of Hispanism.³²

The difference between Said’s approach and my analysis of the links between scholarly work, politics, and affection might best be illustrated by Ian Buruma’s thoughts on the American Islamicist Bernard Lewis, a longtime antagonist of Said’s. Lewis, Buruma writes, has two very different public personae. The first is a “fastidious scholar of Middle Eastern subtleties” who urges the West never to lose sight of

the complexity of the Islamic world; the other, the strident public intellectual who, days after the Twin Towers attack, called upon the United States to go for Iraq,³³ and who later put his scholarly stamp of approval on President Bush's foreign policy. How can this be? Could Lewis's hawkish politics have displaced his nuanced scholarly expertise? Buruma has an interesting hypothesis: "There is often a chasm, of course, between scholarly and political acumen. Misguided imperial aggression has regularly been advocated by experts of formidable erudition. . . . Some of the most ferocious proponents of Japanese imperialism in China during the nineteen-thirties were keen scholars of Chinese civilization. Expertise is often beside the point in political arguments."³⁴

Buruma signals a potential disconnect between scholarly expertise, politics, and experts' affective attitudes toward their field. With regard to politics, he argues that knowing a lot about a certain subject area does not necessarily lead one to make the right political decisions. He almost seems to suggest the opposite, namely that scholarly expertise might, in some way, *prevent* individuals from clearly seeing the political dimension of their field. With regard to an expert's affective relationship to his or her field of expertise, Buruma disagrees with Said. While "Said's criticism of 'Orientalist' scholars, among whom he counted Lewis, was not that they were ignorant but that they were arrogant and contemptuous of Muslims, and disguised political agendas with scholarship," Buruma believes that Orientalism does not necessarily imply a disdain of the other. On the contrary, if Lewis's work betrays anything, it is an enormous *admiration* of Muslim culture. But how, then, do we account for Lewis's militant anti-Islam warmongering in the mainstream media? Buruma proffers a compelling psychological explanation. Lewis does not feel contempt for the Arab world; on the contrary, he might well "[love] it too much": "It is a common phenomenon among Western students of the Orient to fall in love with a civilization. Such love often ends in bitter impatience when reality fails to conform to the ideal. The rage, in this instance, is that of the Western scholar. His beloved civilization is sick. And what would be more heartwarming to an old Orientalist than to see the greatest Western democracy cure the benighted Muslim?"³⁵

Buruma's argument helps show the complexity of the hierarchies established between scholars' own culture and their object of study when the latter is also an object of their affection. For Hispanism, too, it is important to understand the ways in which romanticization,

exoticization, assimilation, and mythification translate into assumed hierarchies between self and other. Hispanophiles and Hispanists from northern, largely Protestant nations like Britain and the United States have tended to define Spanish-speaking cultures as diametrically opposed to their own. For some, this has implied a condemnation of the Hispanic world, and for others, a condemnation of their own cultures. Some have also concluded that both worlds are each other's ideal complements—a notion on which the American Hispanophile intellectual Waldo Frank built his whole career.³⁶

HISTORIES OF HISPANISM

Since the appearance of *Orientalism* in 1978, the critical analysis of disciplinary histories, discourses, and practices has become a field of its own, in the humanities as well as in the social sciences. Although Hispanic and Latin American studies took a bit longer in turning their gaze inward, since the mid-1990s, the debate about Hispanism's institutional history has been increasingly intense and fruitful.³⁷ Of course, the history of Hispanism had been told before this Said-inspired inward turn. The 1926 edition of Espasa's *Enciclopedia Universal*, for instance, dedicates a twenty-one column entry to *hispanismo*, stating that it was especially flourishing in the United States, France, Germany, England, and Italy.³⁸ The history of Hispanism is told as leading from utilitarian to cultural and from amateur to professional scholarly interests, resulting in an ever-increasing presence and prestige for the field as well as for Spain itself.³⁹ American Hispanophilia, for instance, is described as “thriving”; it exalts “our literary glories” and vindicates Spanish history, including the discovery, conquest, and colonization of the Americas:

No solamente se estudia y admira nuestro idioma y literatura . . . sino que también se sacan á luz de los archivos los documentos que hablan la verdad acerca de la actuación de España en América y se destruye la famosa *leyenda negra* que nuestros enemigos y envidiosos habían forjado.⁴⁰

Not only our language and literature are studied . . . but documents from the archives are brought to light that speak the truth about Spain's actions in the Americas, destroying the famous *black legend* forged by our enemies and those who were envious of us.

The rise of Hispanism in the Western world, then, is described with unveiled pride, and it is assumed that Hispanists are willing and able promoters of Spain's national prestige abroad.

While recent institutional histories have been more critical in nature, they construct remarkably similar narratives. Generally, the history of Hispanism is cast as a triumphalist account of increasing maturation. The discipline's evolution is associated with numerical growth and an intensification of rigor, objectivity, discipline, and level of specialization. As the discipline matured, the story goes, it gradually shed its amateurism, ideology, and prejudice. In the recent collection *Ideologies of Hispanism*, both Nicholas Shumway and I evaluate the state of the field in a similar way, associating the discipline's maturity with the transition from Hispanism to Hispanic studies—with “Hispanism” standing for an ideological, mystified state of the field, still burdened by the legacy of cultural nationalism, and Hispanic studies for a diverse, ideology-free, more purely academic discipline.⁴¹

This kind of self-congratulatory account is not limited to literary studies. In their introduction to *Spanish History since 1808* (2000), José Álvarez Junco and Adrian Shubert construct a similar narrative with reference to Spanish historiography. Ever since the Middle Ages, they argue, foreigners' representations of Spain have been marred by stereotypes and misconceptions that the early Hispanists largely helped perpetuate, as they constructed the stock image of Spain as a semi-oriental space fundamentally different from the rest of Europe. This image was, in turn, adopted and sometimes exploited by the Spanish intelligentsia and powers that be. Shubert and Álvarez are happy to report, however, that these misconceptions have been mostly eradicated, and that historians have finally come to see Spain for what it really is. Not by accident, this maturation of the discipline coincides with Spain's belated entry into the European community, where it is poised to occupy its rightful place as equal to the great powers: “If Spaniards can now accept their country as part of Europe, it is time for scholars and their students to do so as well.” As historiography sheds its nationalist bias—which “valued national histories primarily by their diplomatic clout or by the contribution of a handful of their citizens to European ‘culture’”—and changes its focus, Spain will turn out to be just as interesting and legitimate an object of knowledge as the rest of Europe: “When historians concern themselves with topics such as international migration, gender relations and popular culture, among

many others, there is no reason to assign the Spanish case less importance than those of Britain, France, or Germany.”⁴²

There is something awkward about the authors’ celebratory tone. Is normality, a lack of distinction, really something to rejoice in? For Shubert and Álvarez Junco it obviously is because, for them, the view that Spain was “special” meant that the country, as an object of historical study, was unfairly relegated to a secondary status. But the authors are not just celebrating the renewed prestige of Spain—they are also celebrating the promise this development holds for the prestige of their own discipline. Shubert and Álvarez are right to point out that Hispanists used to argue for the legitimacy of their field based on the claim that its object, Spain, was different from all other objects. Its value was thought to reside in its distinctiveness. *What* exactly made Spain different was subject to debate, but that it was different was rarely in doubt. As said, this difference all too easily translated into marginalization. The new legitimizing strategy takes the opposite route: Spain is just like the rest of the West; therefore, the field of Hispanic studies is just as important and interesting as French, English, or American studies. The normality that Shubert and Álvarez Junco celebrate implies that Spain ceases to be seen and studied outside of the European framework. The real implication, though, is that a historiography divested from its cultural-nationalist biases is more mature, more objective, and more scholarly. The triumph of true scholarly values such as objectivity, disinterestedness, rigor, and love of truth also means, however, that the Hispanist field has to abandon its previous strategy of legitimization, which is now condemned as ideological. As a result, Hispanism is obliged to recognize some of the staunchest defenders of the field and its object as fundamentally misguided.⁴³

There is something naïve, however, to the claim that scholarly rigor and objectivity have, at long last, conquered ideology and chauvinistic misconception. In reality, non-scholarly factors continue to, and will always, drive the discipline to some extent—one of them being, precisely, the concern with the field’s own prestige. This has been an issue from the discipline’s very beginning; Hispanists, as scholars of an empire in decline, have always felt forced to argue for the legitimacy of their discipline as against other disciplines—English, French, or German—whose legitimacy seemed more self-evident.⁴⁴ But as they defended Spain as an object worthy of serious study, Hispanists generally also argued that it was a nation worthy of respect, admiration,

and love. This is one of the reasons why the line between Hispanism and Hispanophilia is so difficult to draw.

Given Hispanism's problematic legitimacy, its steady institutionalization in the Western academy between the 1920s and the 1950s represented a hard-won victory. While Spain continued to attract scores of prominent amateur Hispanophiles,⁴⁵ the number of professors and students in programs of Spanish language and literature increased markedly in Germany, the United Kingdom, France, and the United States. These three decades were not only crucial for the professionalization of the field, however; they also include the three years of the Spanish Civil War, which placed Spain at the center of the world's attention. As Hemingway's example illustrates, the war provides an excellent opportunity to investigate the tensions between Hispanophilia, commitment, and discipline. What happened to Hispanophile sentiments, and the scholarly interest to which they gave rise, when Spain became part of a wide-ranging political debate that transcended the realm of academia, in which people were expected to choose sides, take a moral stand, and publicly declare their loyalties?

P A R T I I



WATCHING OUR TONGUES,
PENS, AND AFFILIATIONS

AMERICAN HISPANISM AND THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR

This page intentionally left blank

C H A P T E R 3



POLITICS AND PROFESSIONALISM DON'T MENTION THE WAR

If you're not in the pursuit-of-truth business, then you should not be in the university.

—Stanley Fish, “Save the World on Your Own Time”

How dangerous can professors really be? Perhaps it all depends on the discipline or, rather, on their sense of discipline, their ability to restrain themselves. For most of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the dangerous professor was epitomized by the lab scientist spun out of control, drunk with his own tremendous powers (think Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*). Later, during the Cold War, the Western imagination was mesmerized with natural scientists put at the service of evil regimes or simply bent on world domination (think Ian Fleming’s *Doctor No*). It has taken a while, but the pathology of the mad scholar finally seems to have infected the humanities and social sciences as well. According to David Horowitz, who, in February 2006, published *The Professors: The 101 Most Dangerous Academics in America*, in this post-9/11 world, it is professors in fields like literature, linguistics, peace studies, history, and Middle Eastern studies who pose the greatest threat to . . . well, to what exactly? Decency? Patriotism? National security? “Horowitz,” the book’s back cover states, “blows the cover on academics who: Say they want to kill white people. Promote the views of the Iranian mullahs. Support Osama bin Laden. Lament the demise of the Soviet Union. Defend pedophilia. Advocate the killing of ordinary Americans.”¹ All this, of course, is

shocking. One cannot help be curious and scroll down the list in search of one's colleagues. Alas, none of Horowitz's 101 are Hispanists.

Horowitz—a Marxist-turned-neoconservative who heads up the Center for the Study of Popular Culture, co-founded Students for Academic Freedom, and wrote the so-called Academic Bill of Rights—has it in for American academia. A month before his book came out, he testified before a Select Committee of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives gathered at Temple University in one of a series of hearings to determine if students at state-subsidized universities and colleges are victims of political or religious discrimination by an overly politicized professoriate. For several years, Horowitz has been decrying the overwhelming presence of left-leaning scholars in American academia, which, in his eyes, puts conservative students at a disadvantage and endangers the “intellectual diversity” that is essential to any academic community.

Hearings are held, fingers are pointed, names are named, and blacklists compiled: Can this be McCarthyism all over again? The comparison is not unfounded. Like Senator Joseph McCarthy, Horowitz combines a smart kind of doggedness and a knack for populism with a stunning ability to disqualify himself through unguarded statements and embarrassing behavior. Still, in their assault on academics there are some important differences between the two, as Cold War specialist Ellen Schrecker has pointed out. While the anti-communist campaigns of the 1940s and '50s had a severe impact on academic life—ranging from scholars' fear and self-censorship to the dismissal of untenured and tenured faculty—these campaigns tended to focus on the “off-campus political activities of individual professors.” Communists and former Communists unwilling to rat on their comrades were considered bad apples whose obvious immorality made them unfit to work at academic institutions. It was their “extracurricular affiliations and behavior in particular, their refusal to cooperate with investigating committees” that cost them their jobs, “not their teaching or scholarship.” “Surprisingly,” Schrecker adds, “despite the insistence that Communists were unqualified to teach, no evidence was ever produced to show that those people had skewed their research or indoctrinated their students.”²

Horowitz's position is different and, in a sense, more insidious. Unlike McCarthy, he purports not to be interested in academics' political activities or personal views *per se*. In his testimony at Temple, he presented three main imperatives, which he claimed were wholly

derived from professional and scholarly principles.³ First, Horowitz says, professors should limit the subject matter discussed in their classes to the area of their scholarly expertise and the topic of the course. After all, the 1940 Statement on the Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure, as formulated by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), states that “Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject.”⁴ Second, when addressing issues that are controversial *within* their scholarly field, professors should be sure to separate fact from opinion, present more than one viewpoint, and not privilege their own position. Similarly, teachers should not let their own opinion influence their evaluation of students’ performance. Teaching, Horowitz says, is about education, not indoctrination. Third, universities and colleges, as institutions, should make sure that intellectual diversity is maintained on their campuses. Horowitz, then, reduces the argument to notions of propriety, professional conduct, scholarly norms, and trust. He frames his call for decency, duty, and responsibility within a narrative of decline. Academia has stopped observing its own standards; all he is asking for is a return to the great values of the past.

Really at stake in this debate, of course, are three much larger and older questions that have long been the subject of intense debate, particularly since the late 1960s and, more recently, during the academic “culture wars” of the 1980s.⁵ These questions are the following: what is the proper social role of academics as scholars and teachers; what is the relationship between politics and knowledge—the latter understood both as a product of rigorous scholarship and the object of transmission from teachers to students; and what is the role in all this of loyalty, patriotism, and national security? (Like McCarthy, Horowitz and his allies seem to be particularly alarmed by “anti-American” tendencies among U.S.-based scholars.) Horowitz’s invocation of propriety and professionalism makes it seem as if there exist simple and unquestioned definitions of disciplinarity and scholarly rigor that allow for a clear demarcation between, say, English literature and international politics. In reality, of course, notions of rigor and objectivity do not only differ significantly from field to field, but are constantly evolving.⁶ The same is true for disciplinary boundaries, which are always porous and subject to incessant contention and redefinition.⁷

* * *

What does all this have to do with the Spanish Civil War? As it turns out, the issues at stake in the current academic freedom debate are quite similar to those facing teachers and professors of Spanish in the United States when the war broke out. Throughout the 1930s and '40s, in fact, American teachers of European languages and cultures were forced to reflect on the place of current events, political conflict, and national loyalty in their teaching and scholarship. As we have seen in the previous chapter, the rise of fascism and Communism, the Spanish Civil War, and World War II placed foreign language faculty in a difficult position, sparking debates in the professional journals about pedagogical strategy, teaching tactics, and professional self-defense. The tragic fate of German during World War I—plummeting enrollments, massive loss of positions and prestige—served as a warning to all language teachers that, in situations of international conflict, everything foreign was suspect and no one's job was safe.

In the face of these challenges, the professional modern language organizations in the United States adopted four key survival tactics. First, they insisted on the intrinsic intellectual benefit of learning foreign languages, regardless of international politics. Second, they claimed that the "eternal" or "universal" value of the languages, literatures, and cultures they taught did not depend on the political regime that happened to rule the countries in question. Third, they urged their members to keep themselves in check and not to address politically controversial issues in their classes. Fourth, they emphasized that the most important concern for all American teachers, regardless of their subject and their own opinions, should be the interests and unity of—and their loyalty to—the United States.

In a strongly worded piece written in early 1939 and published in the November issue of the *Modern Language Journal*, Henry Grattan Doyle of George Washington University took it upon himself to provide his colleagues with some solid professional guidance in the matter. Doyle, who was the journal's managing editor, a Hispanist, and a prominent figure in the language teaching profession,⁸ began by stating that what had happened to German twenty years earlier was largely due to "mass-hysteria"—an emotional and "infantile" overreaction of the American public "on a par with . . . goldfish-eating contests between college students, warlike pacifists, the Ku Klux Klan and other 'bunds.'" And yet, the profession itself was not entirely without

blame. The strong reaction against German had also been motivated in part “by the indiscretions, or folly, or lack of good sense and good taste, of a few German teachers or German sympathizers, who helped to provide the excuses, however flimsy, that mass-hysteria can always somehow find ready to hand.” Correspondingly, Doyle argued that two lessons could be drawn from the German case. First, “what mass-hysteria accomplished once it can accomplish again.” The second, more important, lesson was one of self-restraint, even self-censorship:

We must set a guard upon our tongues, our pens, and our affiliations, that we may not give any excuse, however slight, for those who would turn mob emotionalism against us. We must remember, every day and every hour, that we are teaching American children in American schools. Especially does this obligation lie heavy upon those among us who are foreign-born. The native-born American—provided his name does not “sound foreign,” in which case birth here is no protection—may say or do things that the foreign-born American citizen cannot say or do without being subject to misunderstanding or misinterpretation. But in the last analysis none of us should say or do them. We must all “watch our step.” The future of our subjects is largely in our own hands.⁹

Given the threat of professional extinction, Doyle writes, the priority now is not the defense of the particular language, culture, or nation that one has been appointed to teach, but the defense of language teaching in general.¹⁰ No time and energy should be wasted on disagreement over “methods or approaches” and other insignificant details. What is more, “the most senseless, the most stupid, the most criminal way to waste that time and energy is to get involved—we, Americans and teachers of Americans!—in quarrels among ourselves over foreign politics or the rights and wrongs of internecine or international conflicts in foreign countries.” To be sure, faculty serve as “interpreters of the culture” of the nations whose language they teach. But “that does not mean that we should let ourselves become in the slightest degree political apologists or—worse still—conscious or unconscious propaganda agents for any foreign nation.” For Doyle, it is crucial to separate culture from politics. He admits that he has “as profound a dislike for Hitler and Mussolini and all their ways as anyone”; that dislike, however, “does not affect in the least my profound admiration for German or Italian culture.”¹¹

Three years later, George Havens of Ohio State University argued, along similar lines, that the best way for language teachers to deal with

the war in Europe would be to focus on the many unchanged advantages of their subject: “training in these foreign languages has for our students the same great linguistic values it always had.”¹² If anything, learning a foreign language will help students improve their English writing skills—and everyone is aware of the great need for improvement in that area (307). Moreover, since 99 percent of the language students will never actually travel abroad, they “ought not therefore to be affected linguistically by the present world crisis” (307–8). “French, German, Italian, and Spanish literature,” finally, are an “enduring heritage” (308): “the great literatures of the past still remain great and still speak to us with their old power and eloquence.” The great writers, with their “special insight into human character” still have moral lessons to teach, such as the need “to hold firmly to our convictions” (309–10). Havens differed from Doyle in that he did not think teachers should necessarily be silent about foreign conflicts. Current events, too, had their pedagogical value, albeit in a strictly patriotic framework: “let us try to make clear . . . some of the reasons lying back of the tragic civil struggle in Spain, the errors of judgment or of easy-going confidence which led to the sudden downfall of France. . . . We as foreign language teachers must endeavor to inform ourselves, not in order to conceal or condone, but to show our students what we have to learn and to avoid here in our own country” (310).

Doyle, as a Hispanist writing in 1939, was particularly aware of political threats to his own field. The profession could be seriously harmed by strained relations between the United States and Latin America. Mexican President Lázaro Cárdenas, for instance, had just nationalized the oil industry, to the great irritation of the American business sector. More insidious, however, was the Spanish Civil War, because it posed the even greater danger of undermining “our unity as American citizens”:

Even if the Spanish struggle had presented a clear-cut issue of dictatorship *versus* democracy, it would have been important to follow the dictates of good sense and keep the teaching of Spanish free from confusion with the political claims of one side or the other in the minds of our fellow-citizens. But the issues in Spain were far more complicated than that. In the first place it was not a purely national struggle. . . . On the one side was Stalin, on the other Hitler and Mussolini. . . . The situation was made worse by the fact that American sympathies divided in some measure on religious lines.¹³

Given these ramifications, and the “intensity of feeling” caused by the Spanish war, it could well have a long-term disruptive effect not just on the profession but on American society at large. The preventive remedy Doyle proposes is patriotic common sense:

It is no more than reasonable to assume that the right was not wholly on one side or the other in Spain’s tragic and bloody conflict. Moreover, we are supposed to be Americans, not Spaniards. We have no business to allow our feelings about international questions, or our sympathy for one or the other side in a foreign civil war, to divide us as Americans so fundamentally that we can speak or even think of each other in bitter terms. It is our first duty to be Americans, champions of American rights and interests. (95)

Doyle is not proposing a restriction on free speech—everyone has the right to express their opinion on international issues, even if they do so in an inflammatory way. This, Doyle stresses, “is a question for everyone to answer *according to his own conscience as an American*” (his emphasis). But, he adds, “even though we may have the right to be imprudent and intolerant in our words and actions and writings as citizens, we have no such right as teachers” (95).

In support of this notion of professorial self-restraint, Doyle quotes Chester Rowell, a trustee of the University of California who, at the 1937 meeting of the American Council on Education, had argued that freedom of *speech* did not include the right “to require anybody to *listen*” (my emphasis). Particularly in a classroom, “where the audience is compulsory,” the right to speak to that audience “may properly limit itself to the subject of the compulsion.” Teachers, in other words, should stick to their topic, and those who are unable to observe this limitation should probably not be teaching in the first place. Freedom of speech might well include the right to be “fanatical” or “violently prejudiced,” but since “men of intelligence and good taste” refrain from that kind of speech anyway, the person who does indulge in it might well “thereby demonstrate his disqualification for a position in which good sense and good taste are primary qualifications.”¹⁴

Doyle’s plea for depoliticization, then, is double. He not only emphasizes the need to separate the “traditional national culture” of Germany, Italy, and Russia from one’s possible aversion of Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin; but also, following Rowell, the need for faculty to separate their “rights as citizens” from their “special position as

teachers.” If, as private citizens, “we have the right to preach any ‘ism’ we see fit”; as teachers “we are expected to be impartial, impersonal, objective, unemotional, well-balanced, scientific, skilled in the presentation of conflicting points of view with fairness to all sides” (97). In support of his case, Doyle quotes a resolution adopted by the MLA the year before—stating that the Association “makes no discrimination among persons based on racial, religious, or political preferences”—reading it, strangely, not as a statement of democratic principle and free speech but, almost inversely, as an indication of the “complete divorce of American scholarship in the field of the modern humanities from European political, racial, and religious conflicts” (97).

Doyle’s final argument, though, is not ethical, but practical. Jobs are on the line: “The future of our subjects is at stake. Another body-blow, such as that received by German twenty years ago, may be the *coup de grâce* for all foreign language teaching in the United States” (97). The threat of politics, then, is staved off not only by the assertion that true cultural value is eternal and universal, not bound to accidents of nation or regime, but also by an emphasis on the proper limits to teachers’ speech, which in turn relies on notions of patriotism, professionalism, responsibility, good sense, good taste, the field’s public image, and, ultimately, professional survival. Doyle’s and Rowell’s positions on the rights, duties, and discursive limits of the college teacher were widespread enough for the American Association of University Professors to adopt very similar language in its 1940 Statement on the Principles of Academic Freedom, which stated, as we saw above, that teachers “should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject.”¹⁵

It is no coincidence that the AAUP statement from 1940 has been widely touted by David Horowitz and his conservative allies in the past couple of years. In fact, there are some striking parallels and recurring contradictions between the current discussion on academics’ roles and the debates of the 1930s and ’40s over politics in the classroom. These parallels and contradictions become even clearer when we compare Horowitz’s position to those of two other prominent public intellectuals who have written on related issues: Edward Said and Stanley Fish. In an op-ed piece published in the *New York Times* in 2004, Fish urged his fellow academics not to “confuse your academic obligations with the obligation to save the world” and not to “cross the boundary between academic work and partisan advocacy.” “[O]ur job,” he wrote, “is not to change the world, but to

interpret it.” For Fish, “the true task of academic work” is “the search for truth and the dissemination of it through teaching.”¹⁶ The year before, Fish had argued something similar in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Commenting on the fact that Bob Kerrey, president of New School University, had called for regime change in Iraq, Fish wrote: “[N]o university, and therefore no university official, should ever take a stand on any social, political, or moral issue.”¹⁷ Fish conceded that “university presidents are citizens, and as citizens they have the right to express themselves on any matter”; however, “when they speak as university presidents they should confine themselves to matters that matter academically.” Like Horowitz, Fish relies on a notion of propriety. The rights, duties, and responsibilities of the citizen should not be confused with the rights, duties, and responsibilities of the academic. In the end, Fish’s lesson is almost literally that of Horowitz:

[T]eachers should teach their subjects. They should not teach peace or war or freedom or obedience or diversity or uniformity or nationalism or antinationalism or any other agenda that might properly be taught by a political leader or a talk-show host. Of course they can and should teach about such topics—something very different from urging them as commitments—when they are part of the history or philosophy or literature or sociology that is being studied.

The only advocacy that should go on in the classroom is the advocacy of what James Murphy has identified as the intellectual virtues—“thoroughness, perseverance, intellectual honesty”—all components of the cardinal academic virtue of being “conscientious in the pursuit of truth.”¹⁸

Edward Said occupied, at first sight at least, the opposite end of the spectrum. If Fish and Horowitz define the scholarly pursuit of truth as disinterested—that is, free of politics—for Said, scholars’ commitment to truth inevitably steers them into political waters. Moreover, while, for Fish and Horowitz, claims to scholarly truth are only possible within a clearly parceled-off section of reality—the discipline or specialization—Said does not believe that truth can be segmented in that way. For Said, truth disintegrates when it is compartmentalized, and excessive specialization blinds the intellectual to the truth of the whole. Said made a strong case for the academic-as-citizen, that is, as someone who *does* enter public debates on “issues of the day,” and

does not allow herself to be limited by her field of scholarly specialization. “Hence,” he writes, “my characterizations of the intellectual as exile and marginal, as amateur, and as the author of a language that tries to speak the truth to power.”¹⁹

In *Representations of the Intellectual* (1994), Said offers himself up as an example. Although he is a literary critic, he has felt it his duty and right to speak and write “about broader matters,” such as Israel, Palestine, or U.S. foreign policy, “because as a rank amateur I am spurred on by commitments that go well beyond my narrow professional career.” Immediately following, however, he adds an important qualification: “Of course I make a conscious effort to acquire a new and wider audience for these views, *which I never present inside a classroom.*”²⁰ Perhaps, then, Horowitz, Fish, and Said do not disagree so much after all: Said, too, has a clear sense of professional propriety. He does his best to separate his academic persona—the literature professor—from his persona as public intellectual. What strikes one in Said’s career, in fact, is precisely the extent to which he managed to keep his two public selves separate from each other.²¹

As Jeffrey Williams points out, however, Said’s notion of the intellectual-as-amateur skirts the crucial issue of legitimacy: who has the right to emit an opinion about something, and when? Who is listened to and taken seriously? Who is asked to appear on television or write a newspaper column? Said, in short, “fails to account for the channels through which one might gain access to [the] public sphere.”²² Publicly recognized expertise is one basis for legitimacy and discursive authority—that is, media access—but there are other forms as well, such as identity and personal experience. It is true that Said’s public interventions on politics had little to do with his expertise as a literary critic. But his legitimacy as a spokesman on Middle Eastern issues was doubtlessly connected to his identity as a Palestinian exile—a point that he disingenuously skirts in *Representations*, but which did provide him with the polemic muscle to denounce other supposed Middle East experts as un-rigorous, dishonest, and ignorant. His intellectual-as-amateur, then, is not exactly a layman without expertise. On the contrary, in his own role as public intellectual, Said explicitly mobilizes his familiarity with, and knowledge of, the Middle East to attack his opponents, undermining their claims to legitimacy based on their supposed scholarly and journalistic expertise.²³

WHO GETS TO SPEAK?

The complicated connection between expertise and public sphere legitimacy is crucial to understanding the dynamics of the debates that took up much of the Western public sphere during the three years of the Spanish Civil War, in which journalists, academic specialists, and public intellectuals, as well as diplomats, politicians, religious leaders, and eyewitnesses engaged in a rhetorical struggle over the “truth about Spain.” The Spanish Civil War debates also force us to think through the particular kind of affective relationship that a scholar of foreign nations and cultures might have with his or her object of study. As we have seen in the previous chapter, someone like Bernard Lewis has devoted his life to understanding the Islamic world. But as a British academic working in the United States, the status of his scholarship is complicated by his emotional or affective relationship to Islam, as well as by his political positions. A similarly complex dynamic between discipline, affection, and commitment was at play within American Hispanism during the Spanish Civil War.

Spain, as said, forced intellectuals to take sides. But given that, until then, few people in the West had thought much about Spain at all, the views vented in the media and at public events were rarely based on any solid knowledge of the country. This was even true for journalists. “[M]ost American newspaper reports from Spain show commendable enthusiasm and descriptive ability on the part of the foreign correspondents,” the Hispanist Nicholson B. Adams wrote in 1937, “but in general a woeful lack of any understanding of Spanish realities.”²⁴ As we saw in Chapter 1, Ortega y Gasset similarly took offense at intellectuals’ combination of outspokenness and ignorance on Spain. If, as Ortega suggests, expertise is, or should be, a prerequisite for the right to a public opinion, one would think that Hispanists were among the few people entitled to expressing their views about the situation in Spain. They, after all, had devoted their lives to studying and understanding the very country that everyone was now obsessed with. And yet, American Hispanists, following Doyle’s advice, by and large skirted the public debate. The leading voices in the American public sphere, therefore, were those of journalists, religious leaders, politicians, diplomats, and public intellectuals.²⁵

From the beginning of the war, discussions in the media centered on the question of whether the United States should intervene in Spain or not. While polls showed that a majority of the Americans

who were following the war sympathized with the Republic, isolationist sentiment was still strong enough for many to be hesitant about any direct U.S. involvement in European affairs. President Roosevelt, well aware of these sentiments, and mindful of the fact that the major European powers also favored non-intervention, strictly maintained the U.S. embargo on Spain—a policy that significantly weakened the Loyalist side. In addition, Roosevelt did not want to upset the Catholics, whose votes he needed, and whose leadership overwhelmingly supported the Nationalists.²⁶

In spite of the government's official position of strict neutrality, however, the Spanish Civil War quickly polarized American civil society. While journalists and public intellectuals filled the pages of newspapers and magazines with conflicting analyses of the Spanish situation, countless ad hoc organizations were set up to raise funds and support for one of the two warring camps. Significantly, with the exception of the Red Cross and the Quakers, very few relief organizations claimed to support both sides. The most important behind-the-scenes operators in the “war of words” around Spain were the Communist Party—which, among other things, organized the recruitment of American volunteers to fight for the Republic—and the Catholic hierarchy. The Communists were involved in important pro-Republican organizations such as the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, including its Medical Bureau; the American League against War and Fascism (later renamed the American League for Peace and Democracy); and the American Society for Technical Aid to Spain. The most prominent pro-Franco organizations included the America Spanish Relief Fund and the American Committee for Spanish Relief. All of these groups organized rallies and mass meetings, published pamphlets, and generally did their utmost to publicize “their” side’s view of the war, in close collaboration with the Loyalist and Nationalist press and propaganda officers.

The American media, too, became an ideological battlefield. While the *New York Times* struggled to maintain a semblance of objectivity—which rather mechanically translated into a policy that granted the same space and prominence to news reports from the Republican and the Nationalist sides—the opinion magazines quickly divided along predictable political lines. The progressive *Nation* and *New Republic* supported the Loyalists; the religious *Commonweal*, *Catholic World*, and the Jesuit *America* favored Franco, albeit with different degrees of enthusiasm. Both camps were eager to secure the public support of

prominent citizens, ranging from politicians and civic leaders to writers, artists, and stars from the entertainment industry. But no group was drawn into the discursive battle as intensely as the intellectuals. Most of them supported the Republic; many spoke or wrote on behalf of the Loyalists and against the U.S. embargo; and some even traveled to Spain to express their commitment to the antifascist cause.

Academics got involved as well. Robert Merriman, an economics instructor and graduate student at the University of California, Berkeley, joined the International Brigades, becoming the highest-ranking American in the Republican army.²⁷ Harry Ward, Professor of Christian Ethics at Columbia's Union Theological Seminary and founding chairman of the American League against War and Fascism, spoke out frequently in favor of the Republic.²⁸ In November 1936, Professor Adelaide Case, chair of the religious education department at Teachers College, was among the sponsors of an antifascist, pro-Republican peace parade held in Spanish Harlem. One of the other sponsors was Reinhold Niebuhr, who also taught at Union Theological Seminary.²⁹ In March 1937, Rev. Robert Gannon, president of Fordham University, denounced the Spanish "Reds."³⁰ In September 1937, James T. Shotwell, Bryce Professor of the History of International Relations at Columbia University, published a long letter in the *New York Times* criticizing the Pastoral Letter in which the Spanish church leadership had defended the military rebellion.³¹ In March 1938, Professors Herman A. Gray of New York University, Samuel Guy Inman of the University of Pennsylvania, and Wesley A. Sturges of Yale joined three hundred attorneys, law professors, and legal experts in a petition to lift the embargo on war materials for the Republic.³² In April, eighteen American scientists urged President Roosevelt to do the same.³³ In May, Joseph B. Code, history professor at Catholic University, declared that "democracy in Spain lies with the nationalists and with General Franco."³⁴ Among the most vocal supporters of Franco in the American public sphere was Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, Professor of Sociology and Social History at Mount St. Mary's College, who, in addition to numerous articles and pamphlets, dedicated a 1937 address to the American Catholic Historical Association to an attack on the American press, which he considered too pro-Loyalist.³⁵

Given this involvement of intellectuals and academics, the almost complete absence of American Hispanists in the widespread public discussions over Spain is striking. Hispanists not only shunned participation in the nationwide debates on Spain, however—they even

avoided discussing the war in their professional circles. The subject was considered too divisive, and many felt that, as scholarly specialists of Spanish literature, culture, or history, they had no business engaging with issues as general, political, and current as the war. In that sense, it seems, Horowitz is right: academics used to be much more hesitant to participate in public debates on “the controversial issues of the day.”

At the same time, however, thinking about the Hispanists’ potential role in the public debates about Civil War Spain immediately brings out the conceptual limitations of the neat distinctions that undergird the academic etiquette advocated by Horowitz, Fish, Doyle, and Rowell. If one’s very object of study becomes as politicized as Spain did during the Civil War, it becomes very hard, if not impossible, to separate politics from scholarship, topical pertinence from impertinence, or acting-as-academic from acting-as-citizen. If you are an academic expert in a region of the world that becomes the object of heated political discussion, do you have the right, or even the duty, to enter that discussion and to argue a particular position as you would in a scholarly paper? How do you differentiate between your position as a scholar and your position as a citizen? And if you have devoted your life to studying a culture other than your own, what is the role in all of this of your *affective* relationship to your object of expertise? If, as a scholar, you believe you are committed to the disinterested pursuit of truth, what do you do when the truth becomes inextricably political? Does that mean you temporarily abstain from its pursuit? Or do you exclude the larger truth in favor of the partial truths of your scholarly specialization?

These questions certainly threw American Hispanism for a loop. In the December 1936 issue of *Hispania*, the journal of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish (AATS)—then, as now, the largest professional organization of Hispanists—editor Alfred Coester addressed the issue head-on:

Letters and proffered articles have come to the Editor which it seems best to answer publicly in this fashion. The writers are vehement partisans of the one side or the other in the Spanish civil war. An individual has a right to his or her own opinion but it would be the height of folly for this Association or any of its chapters to take sides. The American Association of Teachers of Spanish stands for but one object, to wit, to advance the study of the Spanish language in the United States. It will not promote that end to project the Spanish civil war into our midst.

Hispania, as the official organ of the Association, will not print articles that can be considered as biased.³⁶

Coester's position, like those of Horowitz and Fish, hinges on notions of propriety and scholarliness. His prohibition of "articles that can be considered as biased" presupposes a clear imperative of scholarly objectivity. In fact, Coester does not seem to conceive of *Hispania* as a forum for expressing any ideas about the war at all. Instead, he downgrades the mission of the AATS to its most prosaic, unintellectual level—the promotion of learning Spanish.³⁷

In the 1930s, American Hispanism was still in the process of drawing the boundaries of the discipline, particularly the relative weight assigned to literary versus cultural and historical analysis; of Spanish versus Latin American topics; and of early modern versus modern and contemporary literature, culture, and history. Hispanists' main focus had traditionally been Spanish literature from the medieval and Golden Age periods.³⁸ In the ten years preceding the Civil War, however, *Hispania* featured almost as many articles on Latin American as on Peninsular topics. Moreover, the journal increasingly aimed to keep its readers informed of current political and cultural events in Spain. Between 1930 and 1938, for instance, associate editor Frances Douglas wrote seventeen installments on "Contemporary Spanish Literature," while S. L. Millard Rosenberg of the University of California, Los Angeles, contributed six installments on "Political News from Spain" between 1932 and his sudden death in a car accident two years later.

As Thomas Gieryn points out, academic fields define their areas of expertise through "boundary-work" that serves to identify what kind of scholarly practices, topics, and practitioners do and do not "belong" to a particular discipline.³⁹ One could say that the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War forced the American Hispanist leadership to do some emergency work of this kind, quickly determining to what extent contemporary Spanish politics and history did or did not fall within their professional purview. Coester simply declared the Civil War off-limits for his journal. As we have seen, Henry Doyle would argue a couple of years later that discussion of contemporary Spanish politics did not belong in the Spanish classroom either.

This chapter and Chapter 4 take the question of academic propriety—the place of political questions in a scholarly discipline, or the relation between the intellectual as citizen and the intellectual as

scholar—as a point of departure for a discussion of the wider institutional development of U.S. Hispanism, and, in particular, the impact on that development of the Spanish Civil War and its aftermath. Among the topics to address are the relationship between “amateurs” and other nonaffiliated experts on the one hand, and professional academic Hispanists on the other; the relative importance of Spain and Latin America as objects of study within American Hispanism; and the field’s relative isolation from the other humanistic disciplines in the American academy for most of the twentieth century. I will formulate two main arguments. First, if—as I argue throughout this book—the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War highlighted for Hispanists the tension among the scholarly demands of the discipline (such as objectivity and rigor), the scholar’s affective relationship to his or her object of study (Hispanophilia), and the scholar’s own personal political position in life, I submit that American Hispanists were largely unable to resolve these tensions in any satisfactory way. Instead, their reluctance to engage with politics caused them to be largely silent on the Spanish Civil War; to embrace Pan-Americanism and shift the field’s focus to Latin America; and blithely to accept the new Francoist *status quo*. Second, while a narrow conception of scholarly discipline in effect banned certain aspects of contemporary Spanish reality—the whole war, for one—from the professional Hispanist’s purview, the Spanish war also fueled the emergence of the new brand of “amateur” Hispanist. Some of these amateurs, who were not affiliated with universities and not necessarily academically trained, were seemingly more successful at meaningfully integrating the three elements of disciplinary rigor, Hispanophilia, and political commitment.

AMERICAN HISPANISM AND THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR

Coester’s editorial note clearly shows that the American Hispanist establishment was not willing or ready to engage with Spain politically. Indeed, the major professional journals of the time—the *Hispanic Review*, the *Publications of the Modern Language Association (PMLA)*, the *Romanic Review*, the *Modern Language Quarterly*, and *Modern Language Notes*—largely abstain from the topic and almost contain no references to the war at all. As we have seen, the *Modern Language Journal* allowed for some debate about the stance to be adopted by American Spanish teachers vis-à-vis the political situation

in Spain, but not for any analysis of the war as such, let alone any political position taking. The *Revista Hispánica Moderna*, which had been founded at Columbia University in 1934, did not mention the war until more than a year after its outbreak. In the October 1937 issue, the editors included a note in the “Noticias Literarias” explaining that, given the journal’s mission of “objectively collecting facts that may serve to know . . . the literary life of our times in the Hispanic world,” the *Revista* would from now on transmit all war-related *literary* news.⁴⁰ And indeed, for the following couple of years, the “Noticias” section would include regular, succinct, dispassionate updates on the lives, deaths, and sundry activities of Spanish writers, carefully subdivided into “izquierdas,” “derechas,” and “en el extranjero” (left-wing, right-wing, and abroad). The self-imposed objectivity, though, and the section’s strict limitation to literary life, lend these paragraphs an eerie, decontextualized quality.

Given the profession’s extreme reticence in dealing with the Civil War, the fact that *Hispania* and the *Modern Language Journal* publicly acknowledged it as a problem was in itself exceptional enough. Despite the overwhelming public silence, though, it can be safely assumed that the outbreak of the war split, confused, and scared the Hispanist ranks. The field was probably as divided on the issue as U.S. public opinion in general; Coester’s mention of “letters and proffered articles” indicates that the war did initially prompt strong reactions from the Association’s membership. According to Richard Klein, in fact, the Civil War “divided the association into two camps and there was considerable enmity which lasted for some 25 years.”⁴¹ Ronald Hilton, a British Hispanist who was in his twenties at the time, had been in Spain when the war broke out and soon after left for America. He also recalled that “[t]he division of opinion among American Hispanists was sharp”:

I was at Berkeley from 1937 to 1939, and I do not remember a single pro-Franco Hispanist there. When I came to Stanford, the situation was quite different. The head of the [Romance] Languages Department was Aurelio Espinosa, an ardent Catholic and therefore a supporter of Franco. However, the other senior Hispanist in the department, Alfred Coester, was pro-Republic, and the relations between the two were less than cordial.⁴²

Espinosa, a U.S.-born Latino from Colorado, revered the *Madre Patria*: “At departmental dinners,” Hilton recalls, “we sat around candle-lit tables and swore loyalty to Mother Spain.”⁴³

The field’s confusion is also evident from the fact that the same December 1936 issue of *Hispania* carrying Coester’s note declaring the war off-limits, nevertheless featured an autobiographical report of an American Hispanist’s adventures in wartime Spain. The author was Stuart Cuthbertson, a professor at the University of Colorado who was famous for his invention of the so-called verb wheels and who would be elected associate editor of *Hispania* a year later. Cuthbertson happened to be traveling in Spain with his wife when the war broke out. Surprised in Madrid by the assassination of Calvo Sotelo and the subsequent military rebellion, they nevertheless decided to drive on to the south, determined not to let history spoil their vacation. Once they got to Andalusia, though, they understood the gravity of the situation and thought it better to leave the country as soon as possible. The five thousand-word piece “Escaping from the Spanish Revolution” is a detailed first-person account of the adventures of the author and his wife as they traverse the peninsula from Andalusia to the French border during the first week of the war.

Flouting Coester’s norms, the article is anything but unbiased. Three things strike the contemporary reader of this curious text: the author’s ignorance of Spanish politics, indeed his complete lack of interest in it; his condescending portrayal of the Spaniards he encounters; and his tendency to trivialize the significance of the war. It is hard to avoid the impression that Cuthbertson failed to see the conflict as anything else than a nuisance preventing the American tourist professor from enjoying his vacation. Politically, it is clear where his sympathies lie. For one, the conflict is not a civil war but a “revolution,” and all of the government supporters are “Communists.” The word appears almost twenty times in ten pages, generally modified with adjectives like “cowardly,” “rude,” “drunken,” “impatient,” “surly,” and “childish.” In reality, of course, the Republican forces were composed of Republicans, Socialists, Anarchists, Syndicalists, Regionalists, and Communists; moreover, in July 1936 the Spanish Communist party was still relatively small.

Describing the drive through Toledo, Cuthbertson remarked in hindsight that the Alcázar, then still tranquil, would soon “become the home of some seventeen hundred rebels who were to show an admirably tenacious fortitude in resisting the almost daily attacks of

the Communists.”⁴⁴ (Among the conservative supporters of Franco, the siege of the Alcázar by the Republicans was quickly turned into a tale of Red cruelty and Nationalist heroism.) At Jaén, which, at that point, was still in Republican hands, a friendly guard brought them to the mayor, helped them get a travel pass, and then guided them back out of town. “Thanking him for his kindness,” Cuthbertson writes, “I gave him five pesetas (75 cents) as a tip; he insisted that it was not enough, that he had saved me much time and trouble. But I asked him who started the trouble and drove on” (454). Similarly, in a hotel in Granada, the author found that the waiter, who told them he had not had a raise in eleven years, was “too voluble in his complaints against the owners of the hotel” (455). Comments like these, together with Cuthbertson’s consistent reference to the Spanish “revolution,” clearly lay the blame for the conflict with the Republicans: it was they who “started the trouble,” not the rebel generals.

As the couple made it further north, they learned to deal with the many Republican roadblocks they encountered. At this point, the text becomes a painful example of a colonialist kind of picaresque, in which the superior Americans save their lives by duping the poor, dense, but dangerous natives:

By this time we had learned that joking with the Communists appeased them. Moreover, we had bought a few buns, and whenever we came to a barricade bristling with guns we got out our buns and started munching them. The buns, inquiries about the progress of the war, questions such as “Who is the Don Quijote of this windmill?” and, above all, smiles from Mrs. Cuthbertson seemed to convince these children that we were harmless. Our usual procedure at the barricades was to honk three times, raise the arm, the fist clenched in the Communist salute, and approach the guns leveled at us very, very slowly. . . . We found ourselves pitying the pale-faced youngsters sent out to greet us. The munching of buns was a tremendous sedative to us and to them. They *are* children, and in many cases ignorant children. In some instances we purposely handed these advance guards our passes, written in their own language, upside down; lips moved in their pretense at reading, but they could not read! (457–58)

Cuthbertson’s tone is blatantly patronizing. But it would be a mistake to infer that the Colorado professor does not like Spain and its people—on the contrary, he thinks of himself as a genuine Hispanophile. After finally reaching the French border, he describes

how he managed to get permission to cross to France by assuring the “Communist” official in charge that he was not only a “student of Spanish history, literature, and civilization” but “a friend of Spain who knew that the present discord represented only a moment of abnormality, that a glorious future awaited the country of the Cid and Don Quijote” (459–60). The rest of the article makes clear, however, that Cuthbertson’s love of Spain is premised on a paternalist superiority complex. What is more, in the end, the text does not tell the American reader anything of substance about the Spanish Civil War: why it broke out, what its causes might be, or what the different factions might stand for.⁴⁵ All Cuthbertson can do is invoke cultural stereotypes like “Latin impetuosity” (452) or “Unpredictable Spain!” (456).⁴⁶

It is strange to think that this was one of the rare occasions in which an American Hispanist actually wrote about the Civil War while it was going on, and in a scholarly journal to boot. To be sure, not all Hispanists kept silent. A salient exception to the profession’s generalized avoidance of Spanish contemporary politics is a pamphlet by Aurelio Espinosa, the Catholic chair of Romance languages at Stanford mentioned above. Published in 1937 by the pro-Franco Spanish Relief Committee, *The Second Spanish Republic and the Causes of the Counter-Revolution* is a tirade against the leaders of the Republic and an apology for the military revolt of 1936. In Espinosa’s view, the Republican constitution of 1931 had “anti-religious and other extremely radical features” that “could never be accepted by a majority of the Spanish people.”⁴⁷ In fact, “Soviet propaganda was already doing its deadly work in Spain when the republic was proclaimed,” and when the new government turned out to be more democratic than revolutionary, “the Leftist leaders lost hope and began to organize the class conflict for the overthrow of the republican regime and the establishment of a Soviet state similar to that of Russia” (10). The elections of early 1936, which resulted in the victory of the Popular Front coalition, were tainted by “governmental proclamation and fraud,” and were, in reality, “probably won by the parties of the Right” (13). This, combined with the subsequent chaos, was “sufficient cause, some people believe, for a counter-revolution.” When this counterrevolution finally came in July, the leftists “crushed” it, as Espinosa puts it, “after a series of atrocities, the like of which have seldom been recorded in modern times” (19).

On the opposite side of the political spectrum, Maír José Benardete, a professor of Spanish and Sephardic literature at Brooklyn College, revealed himself as an ardent supporter of the Republican cause. Benardete, a Sephardic Jew who was born in Asia Minor near Istanbul in 1895, had lived in the United States since 1910. A specialist in Sephardic literature, he also published regularly on a wide variety of topics in English, Spanish, and Ladino.⁴⁸ Since the mid-thirties Benardete had written reviews for the progressive New York press, including magazines like *The New Republic*. After the outbreak of the war in Spain, he immediately sided with the Loyalists. Among other things, Benardete, together with the poet Rolfe Humphries, helped translate and publish . . . *and Spain Sings* (1937), an anthology of fifty pro-Loyalist poems.

* * *

Judged by today's perspective—when contemporary U.S. Peninsular studies heavily emphasize the Civil War and its aftermath, and many U.S. Hispanists tend to see themselves as naturally solidary with progressive forces in Spain—there is something strange about Espinosa's booklet, Cuthbertson's article, and their colleagues' general silence on the Civil War. To be fair, it should be added that later issues of *Hispania* carried a handful of more serious articles that touched indirectly on contemporary events in Spain. These included a piece by Nicholson B. Adams on “recent novels on revolutionary Spain,” which reviewed the work of Ramón Sender and Ralph Bates,⁴⁹ and a note by John T. Reid on American writers’ view of the country, focusing on Waldo Frank, John Dos Passos, and Ernest Hemingway.⁵⁰ Both, though, are careful to strike a tone of politically neutral sympathy. Adams’ final paragraph is representative in this sense:

And what are the sensations of the reader when he reflects upon these novels of contemporary Spain? If he, like us, is a true Hispanophile, he will be deeply grieved by the tragedy of a loved people struggling somewhat blindly and certainly very bloodily for ideals not too well defined. If he has any humanitarian sentiment, he will be saddened by contemplating the loosing of primitive and savage passions, and by envisaging the possible direful consequences to a whole continent.⁵¹

As said, the Hispanist leadership’s reticence to broach the Spanish Civil War should probably be taken more as an attempt to protect the field from self-destruction, and its members from losing their jobs,

than as a clear reflection of Hispanists' lack of concern over the Spanish conflict. We can assume that many American Hispanists surely knew a lot about Spain, were very distressed about the war, and *did* take sides. And while it took several decades before they found the courage or opportunity to express their concern and opinion in a scholarly venue, this does not mean—as I hope to show in the chapters that follow—that the war did not have a significant impact on the evolution of the discipline.

CHAPTER 4



U.S. HISPANISM AND THE QUEST FOR PRESTIGE GENEALOGY OF A DISCIPLINE

The evolution of American Hispanism since the mid-nineteenth century can be sketched on three axes defined by three sets of binary pairs: amateurism/professionalism, Spain/Latin America, and literary studies/historiography.¹ The field's professional coming of age was signaled by its gradual academic institutionalization, although, as we will see, the figure of the amateur Hispanist never disappeared entirely. The first Hispanists were generalists who covered Spanish language and Spanish and Latin American “civilization” in a broad sense. Like most philologists of their time, they aspired to “a total view” of a culture, its people, and its language, including a “grammar, criticism, geography, political history, customs, mythology, literature, art, and ideas.”² Beginning in the twentieth century, however, academic Hispanists were increasingly being trained as either literary critics or historians. Finally, over time, both literary studies and historiography split into a clearly defined Peninsular and Latin American branch.

Given this evolution, the overarching, diachronic, and transdisciplinary notion of Hispanism is unstable. It seems more fitting for the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century state of the field than for its current compartmentalized shape. At the same time, it is also true that the current, highly specialized quadrants retain substrata of their disciplinary antipodes. Even the most professional of scholars once started out as an amateur, and—as I argued in the previous chapter—the amateur's affective drive remains present in their scholarship, for

all its claims to rigor, objectivity, or disinterestedness. Similarly, academic interest in Spain never ceases to be mediated, however indirectly, by Latin America and vice versa. An analogous interdependence exists between historiography and literary criticism, although it has to be noted that Spanish history has always had a much weaker presence in U.S. academia than literary studies. As Carolyn Boyd writes, although European history underwent an important expansion after World War II, specialists in Spain were practically absent from U.S. departments of history until the 1950s and '60s. Before 1956, there was only one Hispanist historian at a major American university with a graduate program; by 1970, there were fifty-five.³

Still, the bulk of American Hispanists have always been teachers and scholars of language and literature. The history of U.S. Hispanism has been expertly recounted elsewhere,⁴ so a brief summary can suffice here. Although Spanish language instruction was introduced in U.S. colleges as early as the late eighteenth century, the origins of the academic discipline can be traced to a handful of American Hispanophile travelers, writers, and diplomats like Washington Irving, Henry W. Longfellow, and James R. Lowell. The first Hispanist to take up a chair at a U.S. university was George Ticknor, who in 1819 became the initial occupant of the professorship of French and Spanish at Harvard, made possible by a \$20,000 gift from Abiel Smith four years earlier. Ticknor was succeeded at Harvard by Longfellow and Lowell. As James Fernández has pointed out, the Pan-Americanist attraction to Latin America was largely channeled through Spain. Even though American interest in Spanish was generally motivated by economic and political interests in relation to Latin America, the elevation of Spanish into an academic field on equal footing with other European languages spurred an academic concentration on Peninsular Spanish culture. Moreover, the “Mother Country” was widely considered the source of “Hispanic” civilization⁵—and where to better learn than at the source?

In this sense, Harvard set the tone for the programs and professorships that were soon established at other universities. “[E]ven the institutions which urged the study of the language from the most utilitarian motives,” J. R. Spell writes, “used texts whose purpose was to introduce students to the treasures of Spanish literature. Never throughout the [nineteenth] century did Harvard cater to the practical calls for Spanish; no text dealing with Mexico or South America

was ever issued; and no member of the faculty who taught Spanish ever traveled in Spanish America.”⁶

This emphasis on Spain is ironic, because the rise of Spanish was closely related to the increasing awareness among the American public and its leaders of the United States’ interest in forging close political and economic ties with the former Spanish colonies in the Caribbean and Central and South America. Moreover, the promotion of that economic and political interest quickly seized onto Pan-Americanism as its preferred ideological vehicle. Academic specialists in Spanish embraced Pan-Americanism because it endowed the field with a clear utilitarian and patriotic impulse.

Still, it took the U.S. academy almost a hundred years to begin reversing the tendency of limiting the humanistic study of the Spanish-speaking world to Peninsular cultural production. Latin American historiography did not become an established field until the beginning of the twentieth century;⁷ in literary studies, it took even longer. When the American Association of Teachers of Spanish was founded in 1917 and immediately began a public relations campaign to increase the prestige of their field, it still automatically resorted to Peninsular culture, in spite of the organization’s otherwise heavy reliance on Pan-Americanism. As Fernández writes, this tension was due to the fact that the young AATS deployed two mutually contradictory strategies to strengthen its place in American academia. On the one hand it linked “the study of Spanish with questions of patriotism and national security,” while on the other it attempted to “create intellectual and cultural prestige,” which led “many Hispanists to bracket or downplay the language’s utilitarian value (and, consequently, its Latin American vector), and to highlight the ‘Old World’ culture of Spain.”⁸ Partly due to the association of the Peninsular with the prestigious, Latin American literature was only very slowly recognized as an object worthy of study in its own right, as opposed to a derivative or appendix to Spanish literature. Pioneers in this respect were J. D. M. Ford at Harvard, whose Council of Hispano-American Studies commissioned a series of bibliographies on Latin American literature published between 1931 and 1935, and Alfred Coester, whose *Literary History of Spanish America* appeared in 1916. The coming of age of Latin American literature as an autonomous field was signaled by the foundation, in 1938, of the Instituto Internacional de Literatura Iberoamericana (IIIL).⁹

The IILI and its *Revista Iberoamericana* were, initially at least, a thoroughly Pan-Americanist enterprise.¹⁰ In fact, the role of Pan-Americanism in the development of Hispanism and Latin Americanism cannot be overstated. It allowed the study of Spanish to be associated with fundamental American—that is, patriotic—values, and thus provided crucial ideological leverage for the promotion of the language, the field, and its practitioners. Fernández's analysis of the first ten volumes of *Hispania* shows how the first administrators of the AATS embarked on a very conscious publicity campaign that emphasized the wholesomeness of Spanish in comparison to German—then the most popular foreign language but, after all, the language of the enemy. Studying German, it was suggested, might undermine students' and faculty's allegiance to their country. Spanish was a much safer bet.

It is no surprise, then, that the American Hispanist establishment was ecstatic over Roosevelt's revival and revamping of state-sponsored Pan-Americanism through the Good Neighbor Policy (GNP), launched in 1933. Under Roosevelt, the U.S. government abandoned the ideology of Anglo-Saxonism—which assumed Latin America to be intrinsically inferior¹¹—and its concomitant aggressive interventionism. Instead, the Good Neighbor Policy emphasized the “commonality of the hemispheric experience in contrast to other parts of the world” in a discourse of mutual respect, understanding, and cooperation.¹² Thanks to an intense program of cultural and economic exchange accompanied by massively orchestrated publicity campaigns, the following decade became the golden age of Pan-Americanism as a broad political and cultural phenomenon.¹³ In addition to being a boon to U.S. Spanish teachers and professors, the GNP fueled the first strong injection of funds for Latin American studies—from the federal government as well as private foundations—prefiguring similar injections during World War II (as part of the antifascist war effort) and the Cold War. It is easy to dismiss Pan-Americanism as a more insidious version of the Monroe doctrine, yet another Trojan horse meant to bring Latin America under U.S. dominance and mobilize the continent to serve the interests of *el gigante del norte*. Yet, it has to be remembered that Pan-Americanism in the 1930s and '40s was a big tent that allowed for many different discourses with a wide variety of political emphases, ranging from the most conservative to the most progressive or even radical: chauvinist U.S. patriotism, antifascism, anticommunism, Marxism, and an incipient kind of multiculturalism

based on the recognition of cultural difference and the need for mutual knowledge and respect.¹⁴

From the early 1930s through World War II, U.S. Hispanism enthusiastically rode the Pan-Americanist bandwagon; and it was in the middle of this Good Neighborly euphoria that the Spanish Civil War broke out. A survey of the major journals and conferences suggests that the profession did not interrupt its Western hemispherical celebrations, and largely preferred to look the other way—to the South—instead of engaging with developments in the *Madre Patria*. The program of the Twentieth Annual Meeting of the AATS, for instance, held at Duke University in January 1937, overflows with explicit and enthusiastic references to Pan-Americanism, while Spain is conspicuously absent.¹⁵ Much the same is true for the subsequent two annual meetings, held in December 1937 and December 1938.¹⁶ Still, although no one mentions the words “Spain” and “war” in the same sentence, there are some subtle allusions that could be explained as pertaining to the Spanish tragedy—or rather, anticipating Henry G. Doyle’s advice, as implicit warnings not to let the situation in Spain influence Hispanists’ professional lives. At the December 1937 executive council meeting, for instance, professor John Fitz-Gerald remarked on “the fact that teachers of foreign languages must at all times beware of allowing themselves to be warped by prejudice of any kind in their search for truth concerning the culture and history of the people whose language they teach.” In support of his point, Fitz-Gerald quoted the 1870 opening lecture of Gaston Paris at the Collège de France. Scholarship’s only object is the truth, Paris said, and “[h]e who, for a patriotic, religious or even moral reason allows himself even the slightest dissimulation in the facts he studies, in the conclusions he draws, is not worthy of his place in the great laboratory where probity is a more indispensable certificate of admission than ability.”¹⁷ At the December 1938 meeting, there were letters from acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles and President Roosevelt commending the AATS for its contribution to Pan-Americanism. The State Department had also sent Richard F. Pattee from the Division of Cultural Relations—a prominent Catholic intellectual and, in later years, an important American supporter of Franco. At the AATS meeting, Pattee made a plea for the separation between scholarship or education on the one hand and politics on the other. He underscored the fact that “the teaching of Spanish in this country must more and more orient itself toward the Spanish-speaking republics of the American continent.

No matter what may happen politically in one country, the language will not be involved in the political ideology of that country as is the case with Spain.”¹⁸

Outgoing president Herman Hespelt included a similar message in his 1938 address to the association. The status of language teaching in the United States, he said, is threatened by two “grave dangers”: first, by the “spirit of competition felt by the teachers from one language for those of every other,” ignoring the fact that the foreign languages “have common interests and must present a united front to their critics”; and second, “the tendency to identify support of the teaching of a language with approval of the current political set-up of the country where that language [is] spoken.” Here, interestingly, Hespelt lamented the demise of German teaching during World War I—the same demise that allowed Spanish to surge to prominence, and which Hespelt’s predecessor Wilkins had freely exploited to his organization’s advantage. “Fortunately,” Hespelt went on, “for those of us who teach Spanish, it is impossible to identify our subject with any one government ideology.” Nevertheless, “We should always be on our guard against any attempt to restore the old fallacy. Political systems are like branches on a tree of a people’s culture. Time prunes away those which bear bitter or diseased fruit. So long as the roots are deep and healthy the tree can endure the operation and continue to bring forth good fruit in due season.”¹⁹ The net effect of these exhortations to separate politics from education and scholarship was to safeguard the organization against the outcome of the Spanish Civil War—*whoever might win*—by alienating neither the supporters of the Republic nor those of Franco.

U.S. HISPANISM AND FRANCO’S SPAIN

As it turned out, of course, Franco won, declaring total victory on April 1, 1939. The Republic had lost the war; the country was left in ruins; hundreds of thousands of Spaniards had been killed; some five hundred thousand had gone into exile; thousands were held in prisons and concentration camps, thousands more would soon join them, and thousands would be put to death over the following months and years in a steady stream of daily executions.²⁰ How did American Hispanists deal with these developments?

Eight months after the end of the war, in December 1939, the AATS held its twenty-third annual meeting in San Francisco. As in the three previous annual meetings, the Spanish Civil War was barely mentioned. “Mrs. Maurine Marsh,” the report in *Hispania* tells us, “gave a most interesting travel talk on Spain as she saw it last summer; she said that the important historical buildings were not seriously injured by the civil war, and that the present government had won her admiration.”²¹ The president’s address, by Mary Eleanor Peters, presented a curious kind of veiled epitaph for Spain, cast in a triumphalist American mode. “There is something of a very deep and gratifying satisfaction in the name of our society—the American Association of Teachers of Spanish,” she remarked, “for it is peculiarly significant that we of the United States have been vitally responsible for the preservation of many of the beauties and traditions of Spain.” After all, she said, it was thanks to the American writer Washington Irving that Spain’s greatness was rediscovered, and the country once more became “a shining image of beauty and tradition and culture.” So if Spain did America the great favor of discovering it, America, in turn, “gave Spain back to the world.” “Spain,” she concluded rather enigmatically, “has a future, and America is charged with the development of that future. It is for us to make Spain live in the twentieth century as Washington Irving made her live in the nineteenth.”²² For the rest of the meeting, though, Pan-Americanism once again displaced Spain to the margins of Hispanist attention. One of the plenary speakers was Ben Cherrington who, as chief of the Division of Cultural Relations at the State Department, was the most important government promoter of U.S.-Latin American cultural contact after Nelson Rockefeller. Cherrington was cheered in San Francisco and, as part of the resolutions adopted at the convention, the AATS declared itself “fully in accord” with the State Department’s Pan-Americanist aims.²³

That American Hispanists preferred to discuss Pan-Americanism over the Spanish Civil War is not surprising. Pan-Americanism was far more attractive and less complicated—it was a discourse of friendship, understanding, and peace, not one of conflict. Its overarching slogan was “democracy,” conceived of in a providential way as a continental American value. In the turbulent 1930s, this Pan-Americanist invocation of democracy carried an explicit antifascist undertone, but also, at times, an anticommunist one. As Pike points out, official 1930s Pan-Americanism fed off important countercultural currents from the 1910s and ’20s, including a changed attitude toward nature, American

Indians, and cultural pluralism.²⁴ In the end, however, it was also perfectly compatible with mainstream American patriotism. The Spanish Civil War, by contrast, was a much murkier affair. For one, it was fought in Europe and was thus farther from home. Secondly, in Spain, antifascism was directly aligned—or, according to one's point of view, contaminated—with Communism.²⁵ Third, taking sides in the Spanish conflict went against the government's official stance of neutrality.

In fact, the notion of nonintervention helps illustrate the different affects associated with Civil War Spain and the friendly hand stretched out to the Latin American “neighbors.” Whereas in the Spanish context nonintervention served as an excuse for the democratic West to turn a blind eye to the active role played by Hitler and Mussolini, in the Americas it was heralded as a new respect of the northern colossus for Latin American sovereignty.²⁶ Naturally, in neither of the two cases was nonintervention particularly conducive to democracy or, for that matter, particularly harmful to U.S. economic interests. The lip service paid to democracy did not prevent the Roosevelt government from tolerating several right-wing Latin American dictatorships,²⁷ and Pike admits that “even from its very inception, the Good Neighbor Policy had contained in its mix of disparate elements a sharp cutting edge of economic interest.”²⁸ In Spain, meanwhile, American oil companies, chiefly Texaco, gladly sold fuel to Franco.²⁹ While both the Spanish Civil War and the Good Neighbor Policy were profoundly political in nature, then, only the former was perceived as such. This had important consequences for the engagement in both by the U.S. academic community, whose professionalized standards of scholarly objectivity were, as we have seen, generally seen as antithetical to politics. For similar reasons, the American Hispanist establishment was also quick to accept the Spanish postwar status quo. Another featured speaker at the twenty-third annual meeting was Franco's consul in San Francisco, who took advantage of the opportunity to sing the praise of Francoist martyr Ramiro de Maeztu.

How did American Hispanism deal with Franco's Spain after 1939? The general reaction to the Spanish Civil War described above—a withdrawal into scholarship and a bracketing of contemporary Spanish social and political reality from the profession's purview—set the tone for the decades to come. The few articles in *Hispania* and other journals that do address the social and political situation in contemporary Spain seem to indicate a practically unquestioned acceptance of the Franco regime as the new state of Spanish normality. As early as

April 1940, Professor Gordon Brown wrote from Madrid on "Academic Spain Today" for the *Bulletin* of the South Atlantic Modern Language Association, reporting on the reopening of the University of Madrid, and noting that "the present status of university and . . . intellectual life in general" was "satisfactory if one takes into account the period just traversed."³⁰ Although he explains that the new members of the Royal Academy are now required to swear "an oath of allegiance to the state and to the person of the Caudillo," there is not a word about the effects of state repression, censorship, or exile on Spanish intellectual life. The same is true for Brown's talk on "Las actividades culturales en España," delivered at the 1941 meeting of the AATS, in which the author only notes that "contemporary Spanish thought is guided by a profound feeling of nationalism which lays increasing stress on the ideas, ideals and achievements of the Golden Age and seeks to find in their study inspiration and solutions for the problems of today."³¹

A curious piece by Warren Manning of West Virginia University in the November 1946 issue of *Hispania* illustrates the extent to which some American Hispanists accepted Francoist propaganda at face value. Professor Manning had visited Spain in June 1946. The Spaniards he talked to, he reports, "were apparently contented, even gay, and seemed quite unsuspicuous of living under a dictatorship." "The cost of living was high," he adds, "but no higher than in the rest of Europe, and food and merchandise were abundant." On censorship, he has this to say: "Their press is every bit as informative as the French, and they are fully cognizant of what is going on in the outside world. Censorship of the press no longer exists, and there is no governmental 'curtain' around the country; the 'curtain' has been drawn around Spain from the outside in the foreign press." (In reality, press censorship was not lifted until 1966, and, even then, self-censorship was expected.) Manning's other impressions are equally positive. The streets, he noted, "were overrun with soldiers but . . . they were anything but militaristic"; "the civilian men and women on the Prado were dressed in stylish clothes of excellent materials; and even in the poorer quarters . . . the people seemed reasonably well clothed and fed." As part of a postwar rebuilding program "most of the damage incurred during the Civil War had been restored," and "[s]anitary living quarters had been provided for the poor."³² Many people, Manning writes, "spoke with shame and feeling of the vandalism of the War, when the Loyalists sacked houses and ruined libraries and art

treasures. It had been a common sight, so they said, to come across a Velázquez painting slashed with knives or a rich *mantilla* smirched with mud lying in the gutter. Father Getino, principal mediaeval historian of the Dominican Order in Spain, sadly informed me that his entire library filled with priceless books had been destroyed.”³³ The destruction of culture, in other words, was the Republicans’ doing—Franco was to thank for its restoration.

Manning closes his article with a report of his visit with the distinguished scholar Ramón Menéndez Pidal, a longtime friend of American Hispanism. According to Manning, Menéndez Pidal told him that, after spending part of the Civil War abroad, he had returned to Madrid to find “that his home had been stripped by the Loyalists (*bandidos* was the term he used in referring to them) of all its belongings, his books, papers, card-index files, paintings, and other works of art.”³⁴ However, Manning adds, thanks to a note put on the door by a canny neighbor indicating that Menéndez Pidal enjoyed the protection of the British Embassy, none of the Republicans’ loot was destroyed and could later be safely recuperated from abroad.

This story, it turned out, was not quite correct. The May 1947 issue of *Hispania* featured a letter to the editor, Henry Doyle, written by Menéndez Pidal himself. Manning had evidently misunderstood him: “No pude decir que mi casa de Madrid había sido saqueada por bandidos ningunos,” the philologist writes, “pues la encontré en perfecto estado de conservación” [I could not have said that my house in Madrid had been looted by any bandits, for I found it in a state of perfect conservation]. Moreover, “[m]is papeles de trabajo no fueron sacados de mi casa, sino de un edificio extranjero donde yo los había depositado” [my working papers were not taken from my house, but from a foreign building where I had deposited them].³⁵ Manning’s response to the rectification is interesting for his strange misreading of Menéndez Pidal’s note, and his corresponding refusal to modify his blanket denunciation of the Loyalists: “During our interview, in the emotion attendant upon both the relating and the hearing of the robbery, I naturally assumed it was his own house that had been violated. However, granting the change of locale, the fact remains, an outrage against the individual’s right of private property.”³⁶ Manning does not seem to realize that Menéndez Pidal claims not to have been robbed at all—which indeed he was not.³⁷

A 1949 “Report on Spain Today” by Mary Sweeney in *Hispania* is slightly more nuanced in its attempt to present an objective evaluation

of the country's state. Sweeney at least makes indirect reference to the precarious political situation. While she notes that "Spain looks thriving to the casual observer" and that the "signs of the Civil War to be seen in 1944 have in large part disappeared," she also calls attention to the dire economic circumstances and accurately summarizes the political divisions: Franco's loss of support among the Monarchists and the latter's alliance with Republicans and moderate Socialists, as well as the dictator's continued support from "the Church, the industrialists, the landowners and *Falange*." "Many people," she writes, "support the regime passively believing, on account of indoctrination, that Communism is the only alternative." On the other hand, "the working classes, formerly pro-United States, are now ready to turn to Russia for help."³⁸ In her conclusion, though, she seems inclined to justify the regime's dictatorial methods: "Spain is in a state of post-Civil War. Any government would have to control strong opposition in some way."³⁹ As it turns out, readers of *Hispania* had to wait until 1957 for a full evaluation of contemporary Spanish political reality, including a political overview of the Spanish Civil War and the first decades of Francoism. It was then that Norman P. Sacks, later president of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese (AATSP), reviewed Herbert Matthews' *The Yoke and the Arrows: A Report on Spain*. Sacks's review was a landmark moment in *Hispania*'s treatment of contemporary Spain. In his long article, Sacks, in effect, provided his readership with an extensive primer on Spanish Civil War bibliography, with which he appeared to be thoroughly familiar. Matthews' book, Sacks wrote, was "honest, humane, and informed"; he closed his essay with a list of misconceptions on the past and present situation in Spain that he hoped would soon be corrected—among other things, the notion that Spain was "not ready for democratic government."⁴⁰

HISPANISM AND DEPOLITICIZED LIBERALISM

Although Pan-Americanism was long a crucial underlying driver of U.S. Hispanism, we saw how the first stages of academic Hispanism were nevertheless strongly Spain-centered, in part because of the politics of academic prestige. I have also suggested that scholarly interest in Latin America began to increase in the early 1930s and that from 1936 on, while the Spanish Civil War fueled worldwide interest in the

Iberian Peninsula, the political dilemmas it posed only served to push American Hispanism further into the Pan-Americanist direction—toward Latin America as an object of study, identification, friendship, and solidarity. This incipient Latin Americanist hegemony within U.S. Hispanism was short-lived, however. The defeat of the Spanish Republic drove hundreds of intellectuals into exile, and scores of Spanish writers and scholars ended up in American Spanish departments as professors of literature, linguistics, and cultural history. Their presence no doubt strengthened American Hispanism; it also, once more, put a tremendous amount of weight on the Peninsular side of the Hispanist scale. Contrary to what one might expect, though, the massive influx of Republican intellectuals who preferred displacement over living under Franco did not significantly change the fundamental conservatism of the discipline, or, for that matter, its wariness of politics. The reasons for this continued apolitical stance are complex; they include the historical evolution of American Hispanism, the predominant intellectual outlook of the Spanish exile scholars, and the dynamics of the Cold War. Another more simple and immediate factor was American immigration policy. As a rule, the more radical among the Spanish refugees—the militant socialists, Communists, and anarchists—were either not allowed entry, or soon made to feel so unwelcome that they left.⁴¹ Those who did make it into the United States, therefore, tended to be relatively moderate or simply apolitical.

In the past couple of decades, a fair amount has been written on the impact of the Cold War and anticommunism on American academia.⁴² Most studies have focused on the effects on different disciplines of overt and covert funding programs from private foundations and the federal government. Although these programs directly targeted the sciences and social sciences—area studies in particular—they also affected the humanities; high culture, too, came to be mobilized in the all-consuming struggle against worldwide Communism. The specific impact of the Cold War on the development of U.S. Hispanism has not yet been studied extensively, however.⁴³ The case of Peninsular studies is particularly complex. First, given its intrinsic link to Latin American studies, Hispanism, widely conceived, straddles the humanities-social sciences divide. Second, the Hispanist case is further complicated by its relatively insular status within the humanities. This status, in turn, has to do with the fact, addressed above, that the disciplinary history of Hispanism has been marked by a sense of marginalization and the consistent need to legitimize itself vis-à-vis other,

more prestigious humanistic disciplines, most notably English, German, and French.⁴⁴

In spite of the field's relative marginality, the development of Peninsular Hispanism during the first two decades after World War II runs generally parallel to that of the other modern languages. Here, we can refer to an autobiographical essay by Richard Ohmann evaluating the impact of the Cold War on United States' English departments. While English was not considered an obviously strategic discipline within the Cold War context, and was therefore not among the main benefactors of politically driven funding initiatives, Ohmann notes that it nevertheless benefited from the general expansion of higher education: "The rising tide lifted English along with engineering, math, and science, largely because composition and introductory literature courses were embedded in the structure of university requirements, but also because in those flush times many undergraduates felt at economic liberty to concentrate in the impractical humanities."⁴⁵

According to Ohmann, between 1945 and the mid-1960s, English was "an alternative within the dominant," characterized by an oxymoronic kind of oppositional conformity (87). While English faculty saw themselves as promoters and defenders of values that were in tension with those embodied by the prevailing tendencies of American society—consumerism, materialism, militarism, and commodification—they were unwilling or unable to translate that tension into any kind of active opposition. Thus, their dissent "found no political expression outside the timid and self-promoting learned societies and professional organizations" (87). The profession's depoliticization was further fueled by increasing emphasis on disciplinarity (that is, specialization) and institutionality (that is, professional socialization), driven, in turn, by the desire to legitimate English as a rigorous humanistic discipline *vis-à-vis* the social and natural sciences. Disciplinarity and institutionality allowed English to define itself as a specific scholarly discourse dealing in a specialized language with a discrete set of objects properly isolated from their environment.

Underlying this particular strategy of legitimization was a Matthew Arnold-inspired ideology of culture that defined high art and literature as a privileged aesthetic realm in which social and psychological tensions and contradictions were tamed into harmonic wholeness. Linked to this ideology was the notion—key to the New Criticism as much as to myth criticism and formalism—that a rigorous analysis of

high-cultural aesthetic objects should bracket material, historical, and social factors. The anticommunist witch hunts of the 1950s further encouraged academic humanists to carefully observe disciplinary and institutional limits in their scholarship and teaching. “[A]ctivism was risky,” Ohmann recalls, “and membership in at least one political organization . . . was suicidal. By extension, to be a professional was to be nonpartisan, to abstain from historical agency. Practitioners of literary studies, like those in all fields, should stay within their own area of expertise” (83). As a result, Ohmann concludes, English and the humanities more generally “played a small part in the Cold War . . . by doing our best to take politics out of culture” (85). After World War II, Marxism as an intellectual approach to scholarship “disappeared from the academy” (84); and, in general, the discipline was left “with our moral critique of bourgeois society from the standpoint of culture, while excising culture *from* bourgeois society, severing it from its real historical and social relations, and exempting it from historical critique.” Needless to say, “the exile of historical materialism . . . also turned attention away from the conditions of our own cultural work and professional consolidation” (84).

Joan Ramon Resina has suggested that much of Ohmann’s analysis applies to Hispanism as well. It is important to note, in this respect, that the ideological baggage that Spanish exile scholars brought with them dovetailed neatly with the ideology of culture that, in Ohmann’s view, was espoused by the American humanities at the time. As I have argued elsewhere, Hispanism as an academic field has always been closely intertwined with *hispanismo* as an ideology.⁴⁶ One of key ideological elements of *hispanismo*, in this last sense, is an essentialist and centralist construction of Hispanic culture that assumes this culture to have originated in Castile, and to have spread from there throughout Spain and the Spanish colonies. Hispanic culture is further thought to be distinguished by an appreciation for the “spiritual” that Anglo-Saxon culture, suffused as it is by materialism, is assumed to lack. Many of the Spanish exile scholars who entered U.S. universities in the 1940s were Hispanists in not only an academic sense, but in an ideological one as well. They saw it as their mission to promote and defend Hispanic—that is, Spanish—culture as a unique source of humanist “spiritual values” that contrasted not only with the rest of Europe, now in the violent, antihumanist throes of war, but also with the crass materialism of American culture.

Thus, when the prominent Spanish philologist Américo Castro accepted an endowed chair at Princeton University in 1941, his inaugural lecture on *The Meaning of Spanish Civilization* questioned whether the much-touted “progress” of Western European culture, and its concomitant “material success and prosperity,” might not be, “after all, more productive of horrors than of benefits.”⁴⁷ The long-derided backwardness of Spain, by contrast, now emerged as an alternative, spiritually richer source of civilization. Europe might have plenty of “armaments,” Castro argued, but it lacks the strong “inner defense” of Spanish culture, whose main concern has long been to “bring out the essential man, wholly and in strong relief” (9–10). “At the present time,” therefore, “the Spanish way of life needs less than ever before to offer excuses for being as it is” (11). “I believe,” Castro concluded, “that any contact with Spanish civilization will pave the way for a new and fruitful Humanism” (29).

It is important to note that Castro’s definition of Spanish difference, as marked by spirituality and humanism, goes hand in hand with a particular view of Spain’s imperial endeavor. Being the enterprise of a fundamentally antimaterialist people, the conquest and colonization of the Americas had nothing to do with a desire for material gain; rather, it was “a creative effort” through which “during more than three centuries, Spain expended the best part of herself.” Hence, “Mexico, Peru, Colombia, the Antilles were not colonies, but were, rather, expansions of the national territory that were enriched with rare artistic and ideal generosity” (25). “Some historians still say that the Spaniards destroyed Mexican civilization,” Castro points out, but they forget that the Aztecs practiced human sacrifice and that “Mexicans did not know the wheel and the domestic use of light when the Conquistadors arrived” (27). In other words, Castro questions not so much whether there was destruction, but whether what was destroyed is worthy of the term “civilization.” Similarly, the Spaniards’ interest in America’s natural riches was devoid of any materialist dimension: “The Spaniards exploited gold and silver mines because precious metals were needed for the furtherance of religious, moral and vital ideals.” Moreover, the Spanish “spent most of American gold in such enterprises as churches, palaces, schools, hospitals, printing-presses, etc.” (27).

Ohmann suggests that the depoliticization of the humanities in the 1940s and ’50s was not only a consequence of Cold War fears, but of a particular strategy of disciplinary legitimization that also prevented a

questioning of the power structures undergirding the humanities as an institution. The situation was very similar for Hispanism, which, in addition, needed to legitimize itself vis-à-vis competing humanistic disciplines. Things were perhaps even more dire for Spanish exiles in the United States. For them, the defense of the discipline implied a defense of the greatness of Spanish culture, founded, in turn, on an exculpatory, even celebratory, reading of Spain's imperial past and an assumption of Spain's continued cultural dominance over Latin America. The Spaniards' exaltation of their own culture also prevented most of them from seeing Latin American culture—past or present—as anything else than an extension of its Peninsular mother lode: potentially interesting, but ultimately always impure and derivative. In practice, therefore, the incorporation of Spanish exile scholars into the American academy represented an injection of *hispanista* ideology strong enough to fuel half a century worth of departmental tensions between *latinoamericanistas* and *peninsularistas*. Américo Castro, who himself professed a lively interest in Latin America, could not help offend Latin American sensibilities at every turn.⁴⁸

Of course, the general argument that I am outlining here about the Spaniards' depoliticized academic practice is in need of nuance. It is true that Castro's work, particularly the monumental cultural history of Spain to which he dedicated almost all of his energies in exile,⁴⁹ is political in a more profound sense: it attempts to make a rigorously academic argument in favor of a multicultural notion of Spanish identity—a notion in stark opposition to the more monolithic and anti-Semitic constructions of Spanish identity proposed by Francoism and other liberal historians.⁵⁰ The fact remains, however, that Castro's very *sui generis* interpretation of Spanish history does not suggest a translation into political action. John Beverley, noting Castro's “lack of concern with class and class struggle” and the “denial and deferral of the specifically collectivist character” of the social forces he describes, cannot help associate these aspects of his work with his condition of Spanish Republican exile in a Cold War America: “He offered a vision of Spanish history and civilization which, particularly in its active repudiation of a Marxist or class-based historiography, fitted both the private and public assumptions of U.S. liberalism in the post-World War II period. In that sense, his historiography could be said to have constituted *an ideology* of North American academic hispanism. That was perhaps the source of its power to attract and influence, to create a school, but also its ultimate limitation.”⁵¹

Castro was representative of many of his fellow U.S. exiles in his *hispanismo*, his anticommunism, and his aversion to party politics in general. In that sense, then, the Spanish exiles not only shared the “ideology of culture” that reigned in the American humanities during the first two decades following World War II, but also its apolitical stance.⁵² What is more, at the moment when, in the mid- and late 1960s, English and the other humanities became thoroughly politicized, Hispanism did not. As Resina writes, American Spanish departments in the 1960s “were critical of the Franco regime but otherwise indifferent, if not hostile, to the intellectual maneuvers of oppositional groups within the dominant block”: “Locked in the historicist and philological traditions in which it produced its best work, Cold War Hispanism sidestepped historical materialism, feminism, class, race, and minority issues, all of them congruous with the critique of Spain’s imperial past.”⁵³ Resina further suggests that these general tendencies of Cold War American Hispanism should be considered in the context of U.S.-Spanish political relations. The Spanish exile scholars and their American colleagues did not like Franco, but neither did they see themselves as political actors in active opposition to the Spanish dictator. Thus, Resina writes, “[t]he profession’s conservatism matched U.S. policy toward Franco, promoting a cool tolerance and a minimal but decisive support based on pragmatic strategy” (72). In the end, “Cold War Hispanism was politically anodyne and meant to be that way. Partial to conservative Spanish Republicanism, it hedged this sympathy by showing considerable respect toward Francoism’s cultural reality” (75).

Castro was not a historian but a philologist by training, and his cultural history reflects the ambition of nineteenth-century philology to understand cultures and their peoples in their totality. By the time Castro’s books came out, though, in the 1950s and ’60s, the number of American historians specializing in Spain was slowly, but steadily, growing. How did American historians of Spain deal with the Civil War and the Franco regime? As indicated above, it is important to remember that Spanish historiography has always had a much weaker presence on American campuses than Spanish linguistic and literary studies, which frequently had the luxury of their own separate department. For many decades, Spanish history—or “civilization”—was taught, if at all, by professors of language and literature. As Kagan points out, Franco’s Spain initially served to confirm the widespread impression among American historians of Europe that the country

was of little interest and could easily be ignored.⁵⁴ As Carolyn Boyd and Joan Ullman show, however, the number of Spanish specialists in American departments of history began to increase in the 1950s, as the U.S. government helped improve Spain's international status.⁵⁵ Since then, American historians of Spain have overwhelmingly preferred to study the modern and contemporary periods. The wider recognition of Spanish historical studies was signaled by the fact that the American Historical Association awarded the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize to two studies on 1930s Spain: in 1966, to Gabriel Jackson's *The Spanish Republic and the Civil War*, and in 1971, to Edward Malefakis's *Agrarian Reform and Peasant Revolution*. Nevertheless, Spanish history remained relatively isolated from other European historical studies and, after a four-year peak in the early 1970s, its presence in American academia has been declining.⁵⁶ Like their colleagues in Peninsular literary studies, historians of Spain find themselves in constant need to prove the legitimacy of their field vis-à-vis the specialists in France, Germany, and England.⁵⁷ This fact, combined with the long silence of literary Hispanists, also meant that during the twenty-five years following the end of the Spanish Civil War, public discourse on the topic was dominated by nonacademics: journalists, diplomats, public intellectuals, and eyewitnesses.

C H A P T E R 5

HERBERT R. SOUTHWORTH THE REBIRTH OF THE “AMATEUR” HISPANIST

[T]he best way to love a country is to try to understand its history.

—*Pierre Vilar, Foreword to Guernica! Guernica!*

On the day after Christmas in 1937, the *Washington Post*'s editorial page carried a curious vignette on the Spanish Civil War featuring a famous Spanish professor who happened to be entirely fictional. The 1,100-word “Post Impressionist” column, seemingly more appropriate for the *New Yorker*'s “Talk of the Town” than for the serious *Post*, opens in medias res: “She had come in without making any noise and when he first saw her she was at the side of the chair on which he was standing putting colored pins in the large relief map of Spain.”¹ The man on the chair is St. George Paunceforth, “the foremost American authority on Spanish literature, possibly the world's greatest.” The woman is his former wife Irene, a socialite who accumulates marriages like a child collects stamps. Irene and her circle are concerned about George's obsession with Spain. Although he has not stopped teaching his classes at Butler University, he spends every waking moment working for the Republic. “Do you know what they're saying?” Irene asks him. “They say you're trying to escape from life, to bury yourself in the Spanish war.” She reminds him that he is a literature professor, not a politician; and yet “you go around collecting funds for Spanish relief, introducing Congressmen at the Garden. And you once wrote 13 volumes on *Los Amantes de Teruel*.” But Paunceforth is unfazed, and breaks into a passionate monologue:

"Teruel," he said, "that's it. The big blue light, the one that flashes. You remember, don't you? We were there in September that year and it was cold even then. Today in December 100,000 men are fighting there in the snow. That to me is the reality of Teruel, even though I did write 13 volumes on Diego Juan Martínez de Marcilla and Isabel de Segura, the lovers of Teruel. You see, Irene, I'm not trying to escape. It's the other way. I'm trying to face the world, all that I value, my freedom to think as I please, the dignity of man as a man and not as a servant, all of that the Spanish government fights for today."²

Irene gives up and leaves twenty dollars for medical aid to the Spanish Republic. George, meanwhile, thinks ahead to the next mass meeting at Madison Square Garden.

This fantasy of the Spanish professor who is awakened by the Civil War and suddenly sees the political light prefigures the birth, three years later, of Hemingway's self-sacrificing hero Robert Jordan. As we saw in Chapters 3 and 4, the Paunceforth character was not much more representative of the Hispanist profession than Jordan. American Spanish professors did not rush to Spain to enlist in the International Brigades, nor did they line up to speak at rallies on the Republic's behalf. The writer of this curious little piece was Herbert Rutledge Southworth, a twenty-nine-year-old librarian who was born in Oklahoma, but grew up in Texas, and who, three years earlier, had realized his bibliophile's dream: landing a job at the Library of Congress. Southworth's own political awakening had occurred several years before, when, as a teenager, he spent long afternoons at the Carnegie Public Library in Abilene, Texas, reading *The Nation* and *The New Republic*. By the time he left high school, at age sixteen, he was a self-taught socialist, reneging on his parents' religion (Protestantism) and political orientation (Republican). Following high school, Southworth had worked in construction and the mining industry—where he learned Spanish from his Mexican coworkers—until he lost his job during the Depression. After a summer at the University of Arizona, he entered Texas Tech in Lubbock, from where he graduated in 1934 with degrees in history and Spanish, financing his studies by working in the library.³

Southworth, already a convinced antifascist, immediately grasped the tremendous importance of the war in Spain. From the day of its outbreak, the Spanish struggle became the very center of his existence, sparking a fascination that would hold him in its grip for the rest of his life, consuming all of his spare time and money. Apart from

a short academic appointment late in his career, he never worked for, or at, a university. Yet, when he died in 1999, he left behind four books—three of which are considered major contributions to Spanish Civil War scholarship—a series of polemical essays, and the largest private library of Spanish Civil War materials ever assembled.

Although Southworth's case is exceptional, he certainly was not the only intellectual whom the Spanish Civil War turned into an amateur Hispanist. Many of the intellectuals and journalists who were first drawn to Spain because of the war—including figures as diverse as George Orwell, Burnett Bolloten, Herbert Matthews, Franz Borke-nau, Carlton Hayes, and Noam Chomsky—would maintain a lifelong interest in the country, manifested in books, articles, and activism. Bolloten, a British journalist who worked as a United Press correspondent in wartime Barcelona and later became an amateur historian of the conflict, is most similar to Southworth's, his existence after 1939 became a compulsive, lifelong quest for “the truth about Spain,” embodied in thousands of pages of painstaking and heavily footnoted scholarly work on the internal politics of the Republic during the first half of the war.

For Chomsky, who was only ten years old when Franco declared victory, the war also took on tremendous significance. The short-lived social revolution in the Republican camp, quickly thwarted by the liberal and Communist leadership, helped determine the linguist's enduring attraction to left libertarianism, as well as his principled rejection of any programs for social change that depended on the guidance of an intellectual “vanguard.” Chomsky's first-ever published article, written in 1939, was an editorial for his school newspaper on the fall of Barcelona. Thirty years later, in *Objectivity and Liberal Scholarship* (1969), he wrote a sharply critical analysis of Gabriel Jackson's *The Spanish Republic and the Civil War*, which had appeared three years earlier. Chomsky did not fault Jackson for writing about the Civil War from a particular political position, but for what he thought was a lack of scholarly rigor. For Chomsky, Jackson's “elitist bias” led him to disregard scholarly proof, resulting in a “failure of objectivity” in his account of the popular revolution on the Loyalist side.⁴ Chomsky's status as an amateur Hispanist and historian, then, did not prevent him from challenging the scholarly authority of an academic specialist. This pattern is an all too familiar one in the context of Spanish Civil War discourse.

In truth, though, the amateur Hispanophile had long been a familiar figure in France, England, the United States, and other Northern countries. As mentioned in earlier chapters, the professional academic Hispanist evolved from the Hispanophile intellectual, but the institutionalization of the discipline did not mean that the earlier Hispanist life form had become extinct. Throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, scores of foreign writers and artists, particularly in the Anglo-Saxon world, continued to travel to and write about Spain and its people. These amateur Hispanists were at least as strongly affected by the outbreak of the Civil War as their scholarly counterparts. Unlike their academically affiliated colleagues, however, they *did* often feel the need to enter the passionate public debate on Spain. For Southworth, this entry coincided with his birth as a Hispanist. Having written an occasional book review for the *Washington Post*, in late 1936 he contacted his editor, offering his services as a reviewer for works about Spain. Between January 1937 and January 1938 he published seven such reviews, as well as two analytical pieces and two literary-political columns in the style of the Teruel story quoted above. In early 1938, Southworth was contacted by Fernando de los Ríos, the Spanish Republican ambassador in New York, who offered him a job with his propaganda agency, the Spanish Information Bureau. Southworth accepted.

It was no wonder that Southworth had attracted De los Ríos' attention. His book reviews were both intelligent and unabashedly partisan. Anyone supporting Franco's cause was convincingly shown to be either stupid or misled, while most supporters of the Republic could count on spirited praise. Nor was the reviewer afraid to include pointed political asides. While discussing the church burnings on the Republican side in a review of John Langdon-Davies' *Behind the Spanish Barricades*, Southworth remarks: "[I]ncidentally, the bombs from Franco's Capronis have destroyed far more churches than have the angry villagers of Spain."⁵ In his piece on F. Theo Rogers, whose *Spain: A Tragic Journey* defends Franco's rebellion, Southworth finds himself almost pitying the author, whom he diagnoses as "intellectually confused through circumstance, not through nature."⁶ In the same review, Southworth invokes the overwhelming support for the Republic among prominent artists and writers as a sure sign of the soundness of the government's cause.

Reading Major MacNeill-Moss's book on the siege of the Alcázar, Southworth praises the author for helping us understand the ideology

of the Nationalists. True, the defenders of the Alcázar “were brave, they were disciplined,” but, in the end, “they were traitors, not only to the government of the Spanish Republic, but to the flow of history.” The traditionalist longing for days of old points to “the medieval aspects of the Fascist mind.” Fascism, which “denies the ability of man to think and plan his fate,” is “incompatible with our modern world,” and is therefore bound to lose.⁷ For Southworth, the matter is not just one of politics but of aesthetic and intellectual value as well. While “most of the pro-Franco books have been inferior compositions,” the other side produces high quality work.⁸

After the Republic’s defeat, Southworth continued to write journalism, publishing pieces in the *Nation* and *Foreign Affairs* denouncing the hypocrisy of the Catholic press and warning against the dangers for the United States of the increasing influence of Spanish fascism in Latin America and the Caribbean.⁹ During a brief stint at Columbia’s graduate school, where he studied with José Antonio de Aguirre, president of the Basque Republic in Exile, he became close friends with the journalist Jay Allen. Together with Allen and the historian Barbara Wertheim (later Tuchman), he spent considerable time on an extensive chronology of the Civil War that was supposed to form the basis of a book Allen planned to write, but never finished.¹⁰ Southworth himself, meanwhile, began working on a book on fascism that would also remain largely unpublished.

In the summer of 1941, Southworth was hired by a division of the Office for Strategic Services (a precursor of the CIA), which, after Pearl Harbor, was incorporated into the newly founded Office of War Information, the United States propaganda agency. In the spring of 1943, he was stationed in Algeria, and then in Rabat, Morocco, from where he coordinated broadcasts in Spanish directed to Franco’s Spain. In North Africa, he once more coincided with Allen. After the war, he decided to stay abroad instead of returning to the United States, well aware that his leftist credentials would be a major career obstacle in a political climate ready to resume the rabid anticommunism of the prewar years. (The fact that Southworth had never been affiliated with the Communist Party did not matter in this respect.¹¹) Following the advice of the French lawyer Suzanne Maury, with whom he had fallen in love a couple of years earlier and whom he eventually married, Southworth bought up the army’s radio equipment and founded the Sociedad Africana de Radiodifusión in Tangiers.

He would work as the station's manager until it was nationalized by the Moroccan government in December 1960.

Southworth had begun collecting books and pamphlets on the Spanish Civil War since its outbreak. His work in Tangiers, for which he regularly traveled to Spain, placed him in a unique position to add to his collection, which would, over time, grow to be the largest private Spanish Civil War library in the world. He did not only collect for collecting's sake, though. For one thing, he actually read most of what he bought. What drove him more than anything was an insatiable urge to know *what had really happened* in Spain. The Civil War might have been lost, but Southworth, by now a seasoned propaganda expert, realized full well that the discursive battle over the interpretation, representation, and historical assessment of the war had only just begun. In this battle, access to information and documentation would provide a decisive advantage. For Southworth, therefore, the thousands of books and pamphlets he was able to hunt down with the help of an extensive network of bookstores and dealers were, among other things, so many pieces of documentary ammunition.

By the early 1960s, Southworth, by now retired as a radio manager and settled in France with his wife Suzanne, felt ready to attack. For the first two decades since Franco's victory, no major, rigorous overarching history of the Spanish Civil War had been written. Historical accounts published in Franco's Spain had all been produced under the pressure of propaganda and censorship, and few people outside of the regime took them seriously. Among the Spanish Republican exiles, meanwhile, "a large proportion of the post-war production . . . was devoted to an ultimately sterile polemic between the Communists and most of the rest of the Republican camp as to whether the crushing of revolution in return for Soviet aid had hastened or delayed final defeat."¹² In the non-Spanish West, European historical studies were, as they are now, dominated by specialists in French, German, and British history. Finally, Spain's political situation, and its isolation from the rest of Europe, made access to archives problematic and discouraged foreign scholarly interest. In the United States, serious historical studies on the Spanish Civil War did not begin to appear until the late 1950s.¹³

It was also in the late 1950s that a Cambridge graduate in his late twenties by the name of Hugh Thomas embarked on a general history of the Spanish Civil War. Published in 1961, Thomas's *The Spanish Civil War* became an immediate bestseller, much to the consternation

of the Franco regime. Southworth would soon add his own salvo to Thomas's bombshell. For the Oklahoman, the immediate provocation to finally sit down at the typewriter and put his collection to work was a short article in a Spanish literary periodical: an essay by Francoist intellectual Rafael Calvo Serer on global literary opinion about the Spanish Civil War. First published in *La estafeta literaria* of May 1, 1962 and later expanded into a seventy-two-page booklet, the piece reviews the work of foreign intellectuals who shaped worldwide public opinion on the Civil War. Southworth, more familiar than anyone with foreign interpretations of the war, was appalled by the lack of logic, rigor, and organization of Calvo Serer's work, as well as its intellectual bad faith and overall sloppiness. Indignant, he sat down to write a critique, and before long he had completed a three hundred-page polemical response. *El mito de la cruzada de Franco* was published in 1963 by Ruedo Ibérico, a Spanish publisher run by the exiled Anarchist José Martínez Guerricabeitia, and was followed by a revised French translation a year later. *El mito* uses Calvo Serer's piece together with a similar book, *La guerra española y el trust de cerebros*, by Vicente Marrero (1961), to undertake a painstaking dismantling of the lies that underlay Franco's version of the Civil War. Although only 3,000 copies of the first edition were sold, its impact was considerable.¹⁴ Together with Thomas's book, *El mito* spurred the Franco regime to adjust its official version of the war, and even to create a separate department in the Ministry of Information to counteract foreign scholarship on the conflict. And while Thomas moved on to other things, Southworth was not ready to let go of his lifelong obsession. As a result, he "quickly became the department's main enemy."¹⁵

Having spent several decades closely scrutinizing Francoist propaganda, Southworth's ears were well attuned to the subtle shifts in emphasis reflecting the regime's opportunistic reactions to international developments. In the early 1960s, it was clear that Spain's entry into the European common market and the rise of tourism would inevitably undermine the strict censorship and intellectual isolation that had long allowed the regime to get away with blatant lies. In this context, Calvo Serer's and Marrero's books were little more than hasty attempts to soften the blow by predigesting two decades' worth of foreign public opinion on Spain for a still largely unknowing public.¹⁶ Southworth, for his part, was determined to make their task as difficult as possible.

For Southworth, the work of Calvo Serer and Marrero is representative of Francoist intellectual production as a whole. Its shabbiness and bad faith are symptoms of a deep-seated pathology rooted in Francoist intellectuals' structural inability to face historical reality. The Republicans, Southworth states in his preface, have mostly come to terms with the truth; many, if not most, confessed to their errors long ago. The Francoists, by contrast, continue to base their vision of the war on a series of stubborn denials—"that the Badajoz massacre did *not* take place, that Guernica was *not* bombed, that the Francoists did *not* assassinate García Lorca, etc."—as well as two fundamental myths: "(1) that Franco rose in rebellion to prevent a leftist-Communist rebellion; (2) that the besieged in the Alcázar of Toledo wrote a page of glory for Spanish history." Both myths, Southworth writes, "are only founded on lies."¹⁷

Of course, Calvo Serer, Marrero, and their Francoist colleagues are too intelligent not to realize the fundamental falsity of their claims; hence, the nervousness and insecurity obvious throughout their work. Southworth predicts that this discomfort will not disappear until the Francoists overcome their fear of the truth. In effect, he argues, then, that two decades' worth of strict adherence to Franco's propaganda has led to a species of widespread intellectual neurosis. In this sense, he portrays the Francoist academics as victims as much as criminals: they cannot help being affected by the horrendous intellectual climate—if it can be called that—in which they are obliged to do their work. At the same time, though, Southworth notes that they apparently benefit enough by the status quo, materially and in terms of prestige, to do everything in their power to maintain it. As far as Southworth is concerned, they have basically sold their intellectual souls.

The appearance of *El mito de la cruzada de Franco* made clear that Southworth remained as sharp, unforgiving, and angry as he had been in the 1930s and early '40s when he wrote his biting pieces for the *Washington Post* and the *Nation*. And yet, it is also obvious that *El mito* is the product of a more mature mind. Southworth, by now in his mid-fifties, and with twenty years of Civil-War readings under his belt, had come into his own. He was no longer a journalist, but a scholar, albeit a nonaffiliated one without a doctoral degree. With *El mito*, he hit on the style of writing and argument that would inform all of his subsequent work: an idiosyncratic voice that combined the understated presentation of damning facts with hyperbolic outbursts

of moral indignation. In terms of method, *El mito* is representative of his other work, too. Starting out from rigorous bibliographical criticism, he gradually ventures into extensive historical detective work. This allows him to reconstruct not only historical events themselves, but also the history of their *representation* and the peripatetic transmissions of these representations through a wide range of people, texts, media, and public spheres. His best work in this vein is on the bombing of Guernica.

This particular methodology also means that most of Southworth's work is fundamentally reactive in nature. He writes because he is provoked to do so by other texts, and, like a skilled judoka, he knows how to take full advantage of his opponents' momentum by using it against them. At its most basic level, *El mito* is simply an extended review of two mediocre, relatively insignificant studies with little distribution in Spain, let alone beyond it. The value of Southworth's work far transcends that of Calvo Serer and Marrero, however, and it ironically does so by taking the Francoists seriously—or rather, by holding them to normal standards of serious scholarship, evaluating and checking every single claim they make. In and of themselves, these two books do not deserve the close attention and intellectual energy that Southworth grants them, but granting them this attention anyway allows him to mount an all-out attack on Francoist intellectual production at large.

Southworth's charges are irrefutable and devastating. In *El mito*, he not only exposes the arbitrary organization of Calvo Serer's and Marrero's books, the gaps in their knowledge, and the flaws in their arguments—he also proves, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that much of their work is plagiarized, and that they never even saw, let alone read, many of the books they comment on, most of which, incidentally, were not allowed to circulate in Spain. Southworth, by contrast, armed with his excellent library, has read all the pertinent texts, reviewed all the editions, double-checked all the quotations, and backed up every single one of his own statements. Thus, he patiently proceeds to deflate the Francoist myths one by one.

His second book, *Antifalange* (1967), employs a similar methodology, but is even more focused and reactive than *El mito*. The book is presented as a “critical study” of a text written by Maximiano García Venero, a Spanish fascist disaffected with the Franco regime. García Venero's book is a biography of Manuel Hedilla, a minor figure who briefly led the Spanish Falange Party before it was subjugated by

Franco and eventually incorporated into his *Movimiento Nacional*. In practice, *Antifalange* is a strangely hybrid work. On the one hand, it is a thorough, albeit partial, study of Spanish fascism and its role in the Civil War; on the other, it is a detailed refutation of many of García Venero's central claims. Southworth's book came out shortly after García Venero's. Both were published by Ruedo Ibérico, whose editor José Martínez—a staunch anarchist and antifascist—had initially been attracted to García Venero's work because of its historical significance, its having been prohibited by Franco's censors, and because of the light it shed on Franco's ruthless quest for absolute power. But Martínez had only agreed to publish the vindication of Hedilla with a critical commentary by Southworth, a condition to which García Venero initially consented. Southworth, however, took on the job with his typical seriousness and dedication, writing many pages of detailed corrections and contestations—a subversive gloss, really—that exposed the way in which the history of Spanish fascism was being misconstrued by the Franco regime as much as by García Venero, whose single main objective was to vindicate the figure of Hedilla. The commentary quickly grew to the size of the original work, and publishing them both in one volume became impossible.¹⁸ To make matters worse, when García Venero realized how critical the American's gloss really was, he balked and withdrew. Martínez refused to release him from his contractual obligations, however, and, after a legal struggle, the biography and commentary were finally brought out together, albeit under separate covers.

The major strength of Southworth's second book, if it can be called that (it consists of a fifty-page introduction followed by two hundred pages of notes), is the same as his first: a dogged hunger for the truth that drives him to sift through mountains of available evidence with unusual persistence and intellectual honesty. In this enterprise, he sees no reason to spare his own energy or, for that matter, others' feelings. Thus, in the first pages of his introduction, he states outright that the one major flaw of most books about the Falange, including García Venero's, is their strong but entirely mistaken conviction that the party was, at bottom, a noble and genuinely revolutionary enterprise. This myth, Southworth argues, is completely false. But its persistence makes writers like García Venero "psychologically incapable of understanding the significance of the Rising, the Falange, and Franco's regime."¹⁹ In reality, Falange had nothing noble about it: it was "the Spanish version of fascism"—not a revolutionary, but a

counterrevolutionary, movement, without even a solid ideological basis. Born out of particular historical circumstances, European fascism was never much more than “an ephemeral and primitive political subterfuge, a tactic fabricated for one second of history and not a grand strategy capable of organizing the world for a thousand years.”²⁰ The impact of *Antifalange* was naturally weaker than *El mito*’s had been. Even so, it was reviewed in the *Times Literary Supplement* by Raymond Carr, who labeled Southworth “the most industrious and savage critic of Nationalist Spain.”²¹ Southworth long planned to write an expanded second edition of the book, which he seems to have conceived as a much more thorough study of Spanish fascism in a European context. But although Ruedo Ibérico gave him an advance for this book, as well as a deadline, and Martínez urged him on as much as he could, Southworth never managed to finish it.²²

Southworth’s third book, *La destruction de Guernica* (1975), is his most impressive and influential contribution to Civil War studies.²³ It traces, almost to the hour, the reporting, invention, and complex transmissions through the public spheres of Spain, France, England, and the United States, of the so-called facts in relation to the Guernica bombing of April 26, 1937. The book is, in effect, a study of “spin” *avant la lettre*. Among the many insights it provides are the extraordinary influence exercised by the anonymous cogs in the wheels of the international media, especially the copy desk staff at the press agencies and newspapers; the precise conditions under which Spanish correspondents had to work, particularly in the Nationalist zone; the repeated fumbling on the Nationalists’ part as they tried and failed to control a story that soon proved extremely harmful to their image abroad; the completely different reception and impact of the news about Guernica in different national public spheres; and the way in which preconceived notions, political positions, and powerful investments in particular images of Spain and the war caused otherwise rational and intelligent people not just to accept, at face value, the illogical or contradictory accounts they were fed by “their” press (particularly the Catholic papers), but to defend them tooth and nail for decades. Southworth explains, for example, how, as late as 1973, the conservative Dartmouth English professor D. Jeffrey Hart could write an article for the *National Review* in which he defended theses about the destruction of Guernica to which, by then, even the Franco regime has ceased to subscribe. For Southworth, cases like these illustrated

“the need of conservative right-wing elements in general [for] the perpetuation of the Nationalist myths of the Spanish Civil War.”²⁴

His book on Guernica was Southworth’s most successful work. Published in the United States by the University of California Press, it was well received and brought Southworth some recognition in the English-speaking world. (Through Gabriel Jackson, Southworth had been offered a visiting position at the University of California, San Diego, a couple of years earlier, which allowed him to help the librarians catalogue his collection, which he had sold to the university.²⁵) In the late 1970s and early ’80s, he was asked to write several reviews for the *Times Literary Supplement*; between 1977 and 1979, he published three articles in the popular Spanish magazine *Historia 16*. In 1978, Plaza y Janés in Barcelona published the second Spanish-language edition of *El mito*. In spite of all this, however, Southworth’s mood was increasingly somber. In his letters to José Martínez, he complained that he had lost his drive. He also felt that he had not been as successful an author as he had hoped to be, and he was disappointed at the low sales figures of his books in post-Franco Spain. Martínez, who confessed that he himself did not feel much better, nevertheless did his best to perk up his author: yes, the sales figures were low, and Ruedo Ibérico had lost money on his book. But that was to be expected, given the kind of works Southworth produced. Martínez reminded him that he had enjoyed the freedom to write the books that he wanted to write, and that their historical significance was beyond doubt.²⁶ In his reply, Southworth admitted this was true, but he felt that being an American writer in France had worked against him: the French did not like Americans, and he thought they had never forgiven him for being one. On the other hand, Southworth admitted that he had “given in to the temptation to settle scores with the Francoists and Falangists, and I haven’t wanted to stop. It was so fulfilling [*Me dio tanta satisfacción*].”²⁷ “What Europeans do not understand,” he added, “is how hard it is to be an American leftist.” Southworth was convinced that someone like Pierre Vilar, a Marxist historian, could have never had a successful academic career in the United States.

In his final work, *Conspiracy and the Spanish Civil War: The Brainwashing of Francisco Franco*, published posthumously in 2002, Southworth revisits, in unprecedented detail, a topic that he had touched on several times before: the purported Communist plot to overtake Spain that Franco’s military rebels claimed to have discovered and thwarted,

and which became a key pillar for the justification of the military rebellion in the international public sphere, particularly among the Catholic and conservative pro-Franco lobby in England. With his customary zeal and precision, Southworth not only shows that the four documents used to “prove” the plot were falsifications, but also how, in their passage through different national and international media, they acquired a life of their own. As in the Guernica case, he shows how intellectuals’ political and affective investments in a particular vision of Spain and the war made them blind to the obvious contradictions in the so-called documentary evidence presented. The second part of the book studies the influence exerted, from the late 1920s, on the political vision of Franco and his fellow conspirators by the anti-communist propaganda from the Geneva-based Entente Internationale Anticommuniste (EIA).

Southworth, who had become bedridden after a stroke in the late 1990s, knew full well that this was going to be his last book—and, in fact, he died shortly after finishing the manuscript. In its first pages, he looks back on his career as a Hispanist, suggesting that his decision to focus the bulk of his work on the propaganda war, in which he himself had participated while working for De los Ríos, “may well have been caused in part by a sentiment of indebtedness to the Second Spanish Republic for having given me a cause to defend with passionate conviction.” At the same time, he confesses that “the nausea provoked in my being by the nature of the Catholic propaganda in favour of Franco during and after the war was one of the motives that kept the seat of my pants on the seat of the chair, in front of the typewriter.”²⁸

COMMITTED OBJECTIVITY

Although Southworth’s work would become highly influential in Spanish Civil War studies, and even imposed a new sense of rigor,²⁹ he was a strange bird in the scholarly community. Since he never formed part of any particular school—either in an institutional or intellectual sense—it is hard to place him as a historian or a Hispanist. At the center of his work is a notion of historical truth that strikes one as strangely naïve and, at the same time, highly sophisticated. On the one hand, his whole enterprise can be described as a quest for *the* truth about Spain. In his role as truth-seeking detective, Southworth

embodies a nineteenth-century, positivistic belief in the existence and recoverability of history “as it really happened.” As determined as Sherlock Holmes, he seems fully confident that his method, intuition, and resources will allow him to solve the riddle, to cut through all the layers of lies and alibis, and to discover the true nature of events. In the scholarly landscape of the 1960s, this was a strangely anachronistic position to adopt. On the other hand, however, Southworth’s view of historical truth is also sophisticated, skeptical, and relativist—the very opposite of naïve. Driven by his thirst for the truth, he ends up writing elaborate genealogies, almost in a Foucauldian sense, of discursive truth *constructions*.

Southworth’s heavy reliance on the bibliographical record—that is, his library—manifests a similar combination of naïve faith and street-wise skepticism. On the one hand, it is the foundation of all of his work; on the other, he is more aware than anyone else of the fact that no one account, nor, for that matter, all accounts combined, provide direct access to any historical truth.³⁰ The distinguished French historian of Spain, Pierre Vilar, in his introduction to *Destruction de Guernica*, compares Southworth’s work to that of the painterly *naïfs*.³¹

Southworth’s particular conception of historical truth as the holy grail of a lifelong quest is also complicated by the fact that his commitment is actually double. He is bound and determined to find out what really happened in Spain, but he is also openly and proudly committed to the Republican cause. For Southworth, these two commitments are not in conflict, however. One of the greatest achievements of *El mito* is that it shows that rigor and political commitment do not only not exclude each other, but that their combination can be mutually reinforcing. In the end, the energy necessary for Southworth’s decades-long search for “the truth about Spain” is provided by his political outrage over the Republic’s defeat, caused in part by the betrayal of the Republic on the part of the democratic powers in the West.³² Conversely, the great *political* strength of his work lies less in the author’s pro-Republican position than in its painstaking academic rigor, fueled, in turn, by the conviction that intellectual precision is a *moral* imperative. For Southworth, the immorality of Marrero and Calvo Serer is not so much rooted in their political stance as in their lack of seriousness and responsibility as writers. To be sure, they are discussing many books that were banned by the censors and which, therefore, their readers cannot possibly consult for themselves. But this only increases the moral imperative to be rigorous. They are

unable to live up to their scholarly duties, however: by pretending to have read books that they in fact never opened, they are flouting the ethics of scholarship and traducing the confidence of their readers.³³

In the same way that Southworth's political strength lies in his scholarly rigor, for him, the Francoists' impudent *lack* of rigor is a sure sign of their political weakness. They are sloppy not because they are lazy or incompetent, but because they have something to hide. They cannot afford to be rigorous because that would mean publicly recognizing the falsity of their official positions. And, as said, Southworth is also quick to signal the complicity of the Francoist intelligentsia in its own intellectual decadence. Censorship and the resulting lack of resources provide a partial explanation for their scholarly deficiencies; but if they really cared, they would demand that censorship be lifted. Evidently, they benefit too much by the situation to wish to change it.

For Southworth, then, objectivity—interpreted as an unconditional commitment to truth and scholarly integrity—is not the same as neutrality or impartiality. On the contrary, in the context of the Spanish Civil War, Southworth believes that observers' attempts to occupy a neutral position generally lead them to inaccurate interpretations. “Perhaps,” he writes in *El mito*, “‘impartial’ students of a conflict cannot elude the normal tendency to accuse and defend each side in equal measure, dividing up the responsibility and war crimes in two equal parts and give one to each side: this implies an erroneous vision of the Republican camp, which doubtlessly had the law and justice on its side.”³⁴

A decade later, Southworth revisited this point in a polemic with Hugh Thomas over the latter's tendency, in his history of the war, carefully to alternate reports of Nationalist cruelties with reports on excesses in the Republican zone. Southworth called this Thomas's “penchant for seeking to equalize the blame for atrocities between the two contending parties.”³⁵ For Southworth, it is not the historian's job to be impartial; rather, it is to be as objective as possible in gathering and evaluating historical evidence, and then to formulate a moral judgment.³⁶ Herbert Matthews, the *New York Times* correspondent on the Republican side, and author of several books about Spain and the war, similarly argued that his newspaper's policy of strict impartiality flew in the face of common sense and basic journalistic standards. The *Times* had a correspondent on each side of the war and, early on, it was established that the Loyalist and the Rebel versions of events in Spain would get strictly equal coverage—up to the

number of words granted to each. In Matthews' case, this almost always implied that his dispatches were significantly cut: "in the effort to be 'impartial,'" he writes, the *Times* disregarded "news values, accuracy, and honesty."³⁷ In effect, the paper sacrificed a commitment to objectivity and truth for the sake of a formulaic kind of evenhandedness.

Southworth's decoupling of rigor, objectivity, and impartiality also sheds an interesting light on the recent debates about the place of politics in the classroom fueled by David Horowitz. In a wider sense, it sheds light on the relation between scholarly standards and political positions. When dealing with controversial topics, Horowitz says, teachers and scholars should be careful to give all sides an equal hearing. But what if one side has a clear advantage over the other in *scholarly* terms? As a reader of the *New York Times* wrote in response to a column by Stanley Fish about Horowitz, "The viewpoint that the world is flat is inferior to the viewpoint that the world is round. (Neither viewpoint is exactly correct . . . after all, the shape of the world changes every time anyone turns over a shovel of dirt. But the 'round earth' viewpoint is demonstrably superior to the 'flat earth' viewpoint.)"³⁸

In the end, Horowitz's critique of American academics is based on a naively positivistic notion of scholarship, which equates rigor with detachment and political disinterestedness. This notion also assumes that the institutional organization of knowledge into disciplines corresponds to the world to such a degree that it is indeed possible to teach a class on French literature, say, that does not touch on politics. As Gerald Graff reminds us, this notion of scholarship as disinterested and carefully observant of disciplinary boundaries—boundaries that also provide the foundation of the field's legitimacy and academic authority—was imported into U.S. academia along with the German university model at the end of the nineteenth century. Southworth's work, on the other hand, implicitly and explicitly argues against this ideal of the scholar "who transcends morality and ideology in his disinterested search for truth."³⁹ Instead, Southworth advances a notion of scholarship that is also positivistic, but in which rigor is seen as the methodological expression of a commitment to truth—a commitment that is, in the end, always deeply political. In this sense, Southworth's work is less anachronistic than it seems at first sight. It prefigures a conception of scholarship as a form of political and social action that

would not become generalized in American academia until the late 1960s and '70s.

This is not to say that Southworth's work is flawless. If Southworth's great strength is his conviction that ethics, political commitment, and scholarly rigor all form part of the same whole (with the first two providing the patience and energy to adhere to the latter), at times, the tremendous personal investment in his scholarly enterprise surfaces in ways that weaken his position. This is most obvious in his style. Polemical as he likes to be, Southworth needlessly resorts to hyperbole when his arguments are strong enough in themselves. "It is doubtful," he writes, for instance, about an academic paper given by Calvo Serer, "that a Spanish professor has ever given a contribution at an international symposium that was so poor in research, so slovenly in form, so replete with second-hand and plagiarized ideas."⁴⁰ Similarly, Southworth calls Marrero "the worst critic in the world" in reference to the latter's passages on the South African, pro-Franco poet Roy Campbell (83). A propos of a hateful footnote by Campbell about Lorca, in which the South African takes advantage of the opportunity to praise his own work, Southworth writes: "Certainly no poet has ever written a less generous homage to a more unfortunate colleague, nor has any poet ever judged his own work with such bad taste" (93).

A second major weakness in Southworth's work is his contradictory attitude vis-à-vis other Civil War scholars. On the one hand, as an academic researcher, he hopes and expects that fellow scholars adhere to the same high standards of rigor, precision, and integrity that he sets for himself. On the other, however, he is extremely distrustful of their motives—sometimes to the point of paranoia—and has a low tolerance for disagreement. The most salient example of this attitude is Southworth's troubled relationship with the person and work of Bolloten, the United Press correspondent in Spain during the war who, as mentioned above, dedicated the rest of his life to trying to get to the bottom of the complex internal political struggles within the Republican camp. Bolloten (1909–87) had started out as a sympathizer of the Republicans and an admirer of the Communists, but, over time, became highly critical of the latter's repressive policies toward the anarchists and non-Stalinist left. A first version of Bolloten's detailed research was published in 1961 as *The Grand Camouflage: The Communist Conspiracy in the Spanish Civil War*.⁴¹ Enthused by Bolloten's harshly critical view of the Communist Party,

the Spanish government took the highly unusual decision to allow the publication of a Spanish translation of the book, which—even more unusual—appeared before the English original. For Southworth, this in itself constituted solid proof of Bolloten's duplicity and political perfidy.⁴² Fifteen years later, Southworth and Bolloten engaged in a polemic on the pages of the *Times Literary Supplement*, in which Southworth insinuated that Bolloten had let himself be drawn into the Cold War machinations of the CIA.⁴³ In Southworth's last book, written almost forty years later, the Oklahoman stood by his extremely negative, and ultimately unfair, view of his fellow amateur Civil War scholar as an “enemy of the Republic.”⁴⁴ Lost in between his voluminous correspondence with his publisher, I came across a tongue-in-cheek dictionary definition written in Southworth's hand on a three-by-five inch piece of paper: “*Bolloten*. Noun, an illogical argument surrounded by footnotes.”⁴⁵

Southworth, then, took scholarly disputes extremely personally. People who questioned his claims, or otherwise disagreed with him, were his enemies. He was convinced that they were out to get him, and he thought it his right and duty to make their lives as difficult as possible as well. His relationship with Ricardo de la Cierva, for instance, the prolific and protean historian-cum-propagandist whom Franco had put in charge of the special department of Civil War studies, is a decades-long running gag in his correspondence with José Martínez, whose *Ruedo Ibérico* published most of Southworth's books. As if engaged in a protracted scholarly boxing match, the American is continually looking for opportunities to find holes in his opponent's defense. Most of the time, he succeeds in doing so. In the months before the publication of his essay “Los bibliófobos: Ricardo de la Cierva y su colaboradores” (The Bibliophobes: Ricardo de la Cierva and His Assistants), Southworth writes: “I think that the announcement of the piece has bothered him a lot; let's see what the publication does. . . . [W]e have to try our best to strike a real blow at the braggart [*el pretencioso*].”⁴⁶ The piece presented a devastatingly critical review of De la Cierva's ambitious *Bibliografía sobre la guerra de España (1936–1939) y sus antecedentes*, which had appeared in 1968. Southworth labeled the book a total failure, as deficient in structure as in content, “of mediocre quality and prepared with indifference.” “Never in the history of scholarship,” he wrote with his characteristic taste for hyperbole, “has a catalog been published with so much erroneous information.” In reality, Southworth rightly concluded,

De la Cierva's bibliography was nothing but a façade: "Behind its pseudo-scholarly looks, the neo-Francoist interpretation of the history of the Civil War is being constructed." ⁴⁷ In August 1971, he gleefully tells Martínez he would like to write another piece on the Francoist historian: "He is very angry with me."⁴⁸

Naturally, Southworth's enemies' friends were his enemies as well. Thus, any academic who appeared to take De la Cierva's work seriously was immediately as suspect as the propagandist himself. When Raymond Carr allowed the Francoist to contribute to a collection of essays about the war, Southworth suspected that Carr had been made an accomplice in a concerted campaign to make the regime's reading of the war acceptable to the larger English-speaking public.⁴⁹ Southworth was particularly alert to the subtle ways in which the regime's legitimacy was bolstered by the work of conservative historians of Spain like the American Stanley Payne or the British Brian Crozier, who insisted on referring to Southworth as a "propagandist" or a "Communist."

Payne became the target of a small counter-campaign on Southworth's part in December 1972. In June of the year before, Payne had invited De la Cierva to Wisconsin to participate in a symposium on the war. In the event's announcement, which had been reproduced in the newsletter of the U.S. Society for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies (SSPHS), De la Cierva had been presented as "of the University of Madrid, director of the Study Unit of the Spanish Civil War"—that is, as an independent, legitimately academic historian. As soon as Southworth saw this, he wrote to Thomas A. Glick, president of the SSPHS, urging him to correct the error: De la Cierva, he pointed out, was not "part of the University, but an integral part of the Franco propaganda apparatus." "If Professor Carr in England, and Professor Payne in the United States, the visible patrons of La Cierva, wish to present their protégé to readers and students," Southworth wrote, "would not the ethics of the Academy be better served by telling the truth about him?"⁵⁰ While awaiting a response from the SSPHS, Southworth wrote to Martínez that he was quite hopeful that "this incident will allow us to strike a strong blow" at De la Cierva: "This whole world of American historians is going to talk about, going to find out about this matter, that Payne invited Franco's propagandist and concealed his true identity. This is very important. Was Payne embarrassed to reveal [De la Cierva]'s activities? Why did [De la Cierva] agree to have his true identity concealed?"⁵¹ Soon after,

Clara E. Lida, member of the SSPHS Executive Council, wrote to Southworth, thanking him for his correction. While she stated that the SSPHS was prohibited by law from taking a particular political position vis-à-vis the Franco regime, she added that it certainly was not allowed to praise the regime's employees, let alone under false pretenses. It was a small victory, but Southworth relished it to the full. The SSPHS episode also makes clear that the American Hispanist fulfilled a crucial watchdog function that, in the end, served to protect the integrity of his academic field. He never allowed his colleagues to forget that De la Cierva was, first and foremost, a functionary in an authoritarian regime for whom his employer's political needs would always trump any commitment to scholarly rigor. To hide that fact, as Southworth believed Payne was doing, was to erode the academic integrity of Spanish historiography.

SOUTHWORTH AS HISPANOPHILE

Southworth was not only committed to the Republican cause, he was also a Hispanophile who thought the Spanish people should get what he believed they deserved more than anything: peace and political freedom. In the end, he saw his work as an act of selfless service to Spain. "I have always written for a Spanish audience," he said in 1977.⁵² He saw the Franco regime as a ruthless continuation of the war by other means, and was convinced that any true reconciliation of the warring parties could not occur without "a general acknowledgement of the truth about the origins, the facts, and the consequences of the war": "There may be, and will always be, differences of opinion, but what cannot continue is the situation that has lasted almost forty years, in which only one single version of the facts about the Civil War has been allowed in the country, while a large part of the population knew, from their own experiences, that that version was tinged with falsities."⁵³

In his closing words to his book on Guernica, he similarly maintained that any future "understanding between Madrid and Bilbao" would only be possible if the regime first came clean about its role in the Guernica bombing. In fact, revisiting the event might well fuel a peace process: "Guernica might, under other political circumstances, be a symbol of reconciliation, on the condition that all the truth

be proclaimed concerning the attack and the lies afterward told about it.”⁵⁴

As a well-meaning Hispanophile, nothing irritated him more than the suggestion that he, as a foreigner, was out to tarnish Spain’s reputation. In 1986, he declared that he had written *El mito* “To show Spain that not all of us foreigners were like Eisenhower, who was dying to embrace the *caudillo*.⁵⁵ When Marrero, in *La guerra española*, tries to ascribe Spain’s bad rap in the democratic West to the furtive dealings of an international anti-Francoist “brain trust” bent on reinforcing the Black Legend, Southworth makes it clear that neither he nor other foreign observers are to blame for Spain’s isolation:

The Spanish people are not being deprived of their rights because of a foreign “conspiracy,” but because of the decision of the Spanish army, the Spanish church and the Spanish “élite” that occupies the key posts in the regime, who proclaim to the world that it cannot consider its people intelligent enough to vote. But let nobody think that, in raising the specter of the black legend, this book intends to attack the Spanish people; they are as capable of governing themselves as any other people in Western Europe. Those who demand political freedom for Spain have more faith in the Spaniards than General Francisco Franco Bahamonde.⁵⁶

Southworth was equally adamant to claim his right, as an American, to think, speak and write about the Spanish war, which, “although it belongs to the Spaniards, who have suffered most from its consequences, also belongs to us, also belongs to the history of the world”: “the battle that the Republic represented continues to be a symbol of hope for those fighting for social progress all over the world.”⁵⁷

At the same time, Southworth’s Hispanophilia was of a peculiar kind. He became obsessed with the country long before he ever set foot in it. And although he later traveled to Spain with some frequency, he never actually lived there until the early 1980s, when he started spending several months a year in Sitges, near Barcelona. This distance allowed for a certain level of romanticization and projection. Southworth was a homeless intellectual: he felt culturally and politically out of place in the United States, but never ceased being a foreigner in Morocco and France, either.⁵⁸ If Spain was his real emotional and intellectual homeland, however, it was so only in a virtual way. Having never known Spain before the Civil War, Southworth did not suffer from the kind of nostalgia that, as we will see in Chapter 8,

marked much of Brenan's work and which helped soften Brenan's and others' opposition to Franco. Southworth had nothing but a deep dislike for the mutilated, narrow-minded, and repressive Spain of the dictator. His situation, in this respect, was not unlike that of exiled Spanish Republicans, with whom he liked to compare himself: he longed to return to a homeland that did not exist and had perhaps never existed.⁵⁹ And like many exiles, when, after Franco's death and the end of his regime, Spain embarked on a rapid process of social, cultural, and political transformation, Southworth did not quite know what to think of "his" country anymore. When, in the fall of 1978, he mentioned to José Martínez that he was going to sell his French château and was considering moving to Spain, where he hoped to find sun and materials for his work, his publisher tried to dissuade him, warning him that he was setting himself up for a terrible "social and cultural" disappointment, and that one might find some meteorological warmth in the new Spain, but not much of the human kind.⁶⁰

LIFE AFTER FRANCO

Once Franco was dead, the anti-Francoist intellectual elite began increasing its presence and influence in the Spanish public sphere, particularly through the newspaper *El País*. The new intellectual and political leaders of the country were eager to express their gratitude to the foreign scholars who, throughout the forty years of dictatorship, had stood by the cause. The names of Gerald Brenan, Pierre Vilar, Ian Gibson, Gabriel Jackson, and Herbert Southworth, whose work had been clandestinely smuggled into the country since the 1960s, had gained an almost mythical aura, and a special spot was reserved for them in the post-Francoist media. While Southworth never quite achieved Brenan's legendary status, the expert of the Guernica bombing was nevertheless "adopted" by the newly autonomous Basque Country, much in the same way that Brenan became the pet project of the young regional government of Andalusia. Thus, in April 1977, Southworth was asked to participate in a historians' round table on the destruction of Guernica; a year later, he was invited to join an international commission to establish the facts of the event, and to prepare the creation of a museum to commemorate it, together with Basque culture at large.⁶¹ This museum was finally created in 1998; it now possesses Southworth's extensive archives.

* * *

Southworth, to be sure, is a fascinating figure in his own right. But I would argue that, as a nonaffiliated, independent scholar, he also helps put in perspective the attitude of academic U.S. Hispanists vis-à-vis the Spanish Civil War, especially the way in which the war's political nature made them unable or unwilling to engage with it on a scholarly level. The extent to which Southworth's extra-institutional status provided him with a unique level of freedom to channel his political commitment and Hispanophilia through his scholarly work will become clearer as we look at the case of Paul Rogers, the Oberlin Spanish professor who is the subject of the next chapter. In truth, Rogers had much in common with Southworth; if they had known each other, they would no doubt have been friends. Although separated by an eight-year age difference, both were from a modest and relatively conservative Southern background, both had become politicized during the Depression, both were active in the American League Against War and Fascism, and both immediately chose the side of the Republic when the Civil War broke out in Spain. Both were also staunch Hispanophiles. Yet, as we will see, Rogers was unable to integrate his political commitment into his scholarship as Southworth did. One factor in this difference was the fact that one was primarily a literary scholar and the other primarily a historian. Yet, I would also argue that the difference was due to the particular history of American Hispanism, an institutionalized body to which Rogers belonged, and whose limitations he shared, while Southworth did not.

This page intentionally left blank

C H A P T E R 6



PAUL PATRICK ROGERS FRUSTRATIONS OF A RADICAL HISPANIST

Oh, for the day . . . when I can walk down the streets with raised fist and not be in fear of losing my job . . .

—*Paul P. Rogers, Diary, July 14, 1937*

There is something strangely comforting about running into local friends abroad, all the more so when traveling on the other side of the ocean in a country torn by civil war. On August 11, 1937, the American poet Langston Hughes had got up long before dawn to catch a 3:30 a.m. bus from Valencia to Madrid—a city that, for almost a year now, had bravely and unexpectedly withstood the Nationalists' attacks. While waiting to board in the dark Mediterranean morning, Hughes thought he spotted an acquaintance from Oberlin, the town back in Ohio where his granduncle had lived and his grandparents had gone to college, and which he still liked to visit. “Hello,” Hughes yelled, “Rogers!” Upon hearing his name, the man turned his head and smiled, just as surprised and glad as the poet with the fortuitous encounter and the chance to travel to Madrid together.¹

Langston Hughes was among the most famous of the scores of American intellectuals to visit wartime Spain—he spent several months in the country on a newspaper assignment, publishing articles and poems on the Republic’s struggle against fascism in American newspapers and magazines. His friend Paul Patrick Rogers, a thirty-seven-year-old Spanish professor at Oberlin College, was not nearly as well known. And yet, Rogers’ month-long presence in Civil War Spain in

August 1937 was, in a sense, more noteworthy than Hughes'. A great many American writers traveled to Spain to express their support for the embattled Republic.² At one point, it seemed that the whole East Coast liberal literary establishment was there. Waldo Frank, John Dos Passos, Ernest Hemingway, Martha Gellhorn, Edwin Rolfe, Paul Robeson, and many others felt the moral need to present themselves, fist raised, at the front of the world struggle against fascism. An additional 2,800 Americans from all walks of life, including a number of college students and faculty, had joined the more than 30,000 volunteers from all over the world in taking up arms against fascism. But although there had been some American Spanish professors who had happened to be in Spain when hostilities broke out, as far as I have been able to ascertain, Rogers was the only American-born Hispanist expressly to travel to Spain during the war.³ As we saw in Chapter 3, many other American Hispanists steered clear of the conflict altogether, and were even hesitant to bring up the subject in their classes. What made things different for Rogers?

In a sense, Rogers was as close as history got to a real-life incarnation of Robert Jordan, Hemingway's fictional Hispanist hero from Montana.⁴ For the Spanish professor from Oberlin, going to Spain was not just a matter of war tourism. It was a much more personal affair. In reality, his trip represented the convergence and culmination of the two chief vocations that had shaped his life thus far: a profound affective and intellectual attraction to Spanish history and culture, and a deeply felt political commitment to fight social injustice everywhere, but particularly in its economic and racial manifestations. Ever since the outbreak of the war in the summer of 1936, Rogers had been obsessed with events in Spain and frustrated by its substandard coverage in the American press.⁵ By the summer of 1937, the urge to go and see things for himself had become so strong that he decided to leave his wife and two young children behind, take the boat to France, and try, in whatever way possible, to make it over the Pyrenees, in spite of the fact that the U.S. State Department had expressly forbidden entry to Spain to all American citizens. Rogers knew that going to Spain meant risking his life and his career. But the Republican cause was too important, the pull of danger and excitement too strong. Rogers seemed to feel he could not live with himself if he had not tried to stand by the country he loved at one of the most critical moments in its history, and indeed a critical moment in the history of the world.

THE MAKING OF AN ANTIFASCIST

A brief look at Rogers' life makes clear that his trip to Civil War Spain was the logical consequence of an intellectual and political development that had begun decades before. By 1937, he was well advanced in a successful academic career as a Hispanist. He had been at Oberlin for almost ten years, had been promoted to Associate Professor, and was beginning to make a national name for himself as a specialist in nineteenth-century Spanish literature. At the same time, however, he had developed an active political life and had become a prominent figure in progressive circles in both Oberlin and Cleveland. When the Spanish war broke out, he had been warning his fellow countrymen against fascism for years, had regularly appeared as a speaker at protest rallies, and been involved in various left-wing political organizations.

On one hand, his political evolution was a sign of the times—as with many of his generation, his move to the Left had occurred in the context of the Depression, the threat of fascism, and the widespread disillusion with parliamentary democracy. But the speed and intensity of Rogers' radicalization can also be traced back to his personal background. His father, Patrick Simpson Rogers, was a Baptist minister whose progressive values and religious zeal had condemned him and his family to an existence that was as nomadic as it was chronically poor. His son Paul Patrick was born in January 1900 in Snohomish, Washington, an area in the wild and empty West where his father was on a mission assignment. Rogers, Sr.—blind in one eye, and born in 1866 into an indigent family in the post-Civil War South—had hoped to become a lawyer, but his yearning to do good in the world eventually drove him toward missionary work. After their brief stint in the Northwest, the family moved back to south Louisiana, and from there to Mississippi and Arkansas. The relocation to Ozark resulted in a pay raise, but the locals demanded that the minister join the Ku Klux Klan. His refusal to do so, and his unheard-of practice of allowing blacks into the congregation, caused enough tension for the Rogers family to quickly move on. This pattern was repeated several times.⁶

His father's principled ethics marked Paul Rogers for the rest of his life, as did the rural, poor, racist, and often hostile environment in which he spent his childhood and youth. It left him with frugal habits, a strong awareness of economic status, a permanent desire for financial, as well as moral, improvement, an instinctive solidarity with the economic, ethnic, and racial underdog, and an equally instinctive

distrust of the wealthy and powerful. It also made him an individualist who believed in self-reliance above everything else. And although Paul Rogers did not follow in his father's confessional footsteps, to the contrary, he did inherit his stubborn resistance to bigotry, confidence in his own moral judgment, and zeal for improving the world.

A voracious reader since his childhood—it was books such as H. G. Wells' *History of the World* that drove him away from religion; he later developed a keen taste for the social realism of John Steinbeck, Upton Sinclair, and Sinclair Lewis—Rogers went to college at the University of Mississippi. In the four years at Ole Miss, he worked on the editorial staff of the *Mississippian* (in which capacity he occasionally published contributions from his fellow student William Faulkner), acquired a knack for methodical scientific work (he briefly considered becoming a geologist), and developed a love of languages. After graduating in 1921, Rogers continued his education while holding an itinerant series of teaching appointments. In four years' time, he worked at the universities of Chicago, Colorado, Nebraska, and Cincinnati. Meanwhile, he got married and had a son. In 1925, he received a master's degree in Romance Languages from Acadia University, and a second son was born. Three years later, he earned his PhD from Cornell, with a dissertation on pre-romantic drama.

In Ithaca, he took classes with Federico de Onís, who had been in the United States since 1916. He also met the Spanish poet León Felipe, with whom he struck up a lifelong friendship. Meanwhile, he had begun publishing the fruits of his early research: a first article on Spanish theater had appeared in *Hispania* in 1923; in the next five years, Rogers brought out two annotated editions of Spanish plays. By 1928, his first marriage had failed, and Rogers was left with the custody of his two young children. Soon after, he concluded the long period of continuous moves that had marked his life thus far. He applied for an assistant professor position at one of the nation's best private colleges, Oberlin, and was hired. He would remain there from 1929 until his retirement in 1966.

Among students and faculty at Oberlin, Rogers was often considered something of a character. Straight as an arrow, with a self-confidence bordering on arrogance, always impeccably dressed and with a thin moustache above the upper lip—as the years passed, he acquired a certain reputation of *homme fatal*—he saw himself as a self-made man, proud to have pulled himself by his own bootstraps from his poor Southern background.⁷ It was this same background that made

him especially sensitive to poverty and racial discrimination. The experience of the Depression further fueled his moral indignation and his desire for radical social change. As his son Douglass wrote, by the mid-1930s Rogers' sociopolitical awareness was "so acute . . . that he seemed to take public injustices as personal affronts to himself."⁸ From the early 1930s, he became involved with unionization efforts, labor strikes, opposition against alien sedition or "gag" laws, and protests against the reactionary press, particularly the Hearst papers.⁹

Rogers, who never left home without a hat, and who must have been the best dressed radical in the northern Ohio area, was a man of contradictions. For one, his self-confidence, the fruit of years of hard work, was less unshakable than he would have liked it to be. Hiding behind his controlled, aristocratic demeanor, on the other hand, was a strong capacity for friendship and solidarity. ("Hobos" and "tramps" on their way through Oberlin knew they could always count on a warm snack from the Spanish professor on East College Street, his son recalls.¹⁰) His staunch individualism, love of reading and learning, and penchant for independent thinking did not prevent him from idealizing the working class and collectivist forms of social organization. Aesthetically, he was a populist, too: he was the proud owner of an extensive record collection of Depression-inspired songs, which he sang around the house as he did repairs, boiled maple syrup, or made wine. (In later years, he would publish a pseudonymous best-selling manual on *Winemaking at Home*.)

His populism was political, as well. Over time, Rogers forged a close relationship with radical left-wing movements, whose emphasis on discipline and direct action attracted him a great deal, as did the theoretical clarity of historical materialism. A hands-on man himself, he was given to impatience and had always preferred facts and deeds to idle speculation. At the same time, however, he admired, supported, and voted for Franklin D. Roosevelt. In this respect, as in others, he was typical of the generation of Progressives that reached political maturity during the years of the Popular Front, for whom liberalism, patriotism, and leftist radicalism were not mutually exclusive. To the contrary, it was the economic and political elite, the oppressors of the poor, who were really betraying the country. In a 1937 exposé on Cleveland for the antifascist magazine *Fight*, Rogers imagined the field day an investigative journalist would have with the city's corrupt political leaders. Among other things, the muckraker would unearth

“the whole sordid story of how the elect of Cleveland have bled the people and nearly brought to ruin the City’s economic structure.”¹¹

A compulsive reader of newspapers and exceptionally alert to international developments,¹² Rogers was quick to recognize the dangers of fascism, the symptoms of which he saw all around him, in the United States as much as in Europe. Soon after its foundation in 1933, Rogers joined the American League against War and Fascism, the most important antifascist organization in the United States,¹³ becoming founding chairman of the Cleveland branch two years later. The high point of his career as an activist was his role in organizing the League’s third national congress in Cleveland. On January 3, 1936, he was the first to address the plenary session of 10,000 delegates.

It seems that Rogers traveled several times to Europe in the 1920s and ’30s, spending time in France and Spain, where he became acquainted with the representatives of Spain’s cultural revival.¹⁴ In 1927, still in Ithaca, Rogers was pleasantly surprised—and slightly amused—to hear that the Spanish king, Alfonso XIII, had decided to honor him with a knighthood in the order of Isabel la Católica in appreciation of an article, published in *Hispania* that same year, demonstrating the important influence exerted by Spanish literature on French letters.¹⁵ (Until then, literary historiography had routinely emphasized the French influence on Spain.) Despite this royal honor, however, Rogers strongly sympathized with the modernizing Spanish Left and, like practically all the Spanish intellectuals and artists of the day, welcomed the proclamation of the Republic in April 1931. When the war broke out five years later, he was shocked and dismayed—and naturally sided with the government of the Popular Front.

The outbreak of the war provided Rogers with new challenges and opportunities. For the first time in his life, there was an obvious, organic link between his political activism and his academic profession: Spain, now on everyone’s mind, had been on Rogers’ for years. As a Spanish professor and known leftist, he almost automatically assumed an active role in the local, regional, and national organizations working in favor of the Loyalist cause, particularly the American League and the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy. Throughout the 1936–37 academic year, Rogers did what he could to support the cause: he helped organize fundraisers in Oberlin and Cleveland, talked extensively about the war with his colleagues and students, signed letters of protest against anti-Loyalist censorship, and helped host pro-Republican speakers.¹⁶ In the summer of 1937,

he was asked to contribute a piece on Spain for the American League's national monthly, *Fight*. Rogers happily complied, writing a long article placing the Civil War in the context of Spanish cultural history. Strangely, however, it was to be his first and only published text on the Spanish Civil War for the next forty years.

As we have seen, Rogers' decision to go to Spain was no more representative of his American Hispanist colleagues' stance than Robert Jordan's fictional militancy in the Republican forces. Even so, I would argue that his case serves as an illustrative example of the dilemmas that American Hispanists faced after the outbreak of the war in Spain, particularly with regard to the tension between scholarly norms and values, Hispanophilia, and political commitment. Although the known record of Rogers' public interventions on the Spanish Civil War in the 1930s is limited to a few newspaper reports, a magazine piece, and a radio talk, he also wrote a detailed diary covering one month in Paris and two-and-a-half weeks in Spain. This travel journal, which Rogers donated to the Harry Ransom Center in Austin, Texas, before he died, offers a remarkable glimpse not only into life in the Republican zone, but also into the psyche of a left-wing American Hispanist during the Civil War. In a larger framework, Rogers' reaction to the war, his perceptions and judgments as recorded in his diary, and his subsequent life and career back home provide some cues for a more general reflection on the long-term institutional impact of the war in Spain on the development of U.S. Hispanism during the years of the Cold War.¹⁷

At first glance, Rogers is not a self-evident choice for the biographical and institutional study that this book aims to be. His case is, in several ways, as exceptional as that of Southworth, with whom he shared a similar social and political profile. Still, his situation presents enough striking contrasts with the Oklahoman's to make for a productive comparison. One crucial difference between the two directly affects my approach to their lives and work: Southworth, as we have seen, left ample documentation of his obsession with the Spanish Civil War. The aspect that makes Rogers' case so fascinating is that, despite his obvious political commitment and the clearly central place in his life of his experience in wartime Spain, his silence on the topic was, for decades, practically complete. To make things worse, the remaining materials available to the biographer are rather scant: Rogers was an extremely private man, and he made sure to destroy the bulk of his papers toward the end of his life. If I have nevertheless chosen to focus

on him, it is because I believe that his case tells us a lot about the dilemmas and constraints of professional academic American Hispanism in the mid-twentieth century. In spite of the difficulties of an admittedly restricted amount of evidence, the argument can be made that Rogers' disinclination to write or speak publicly about the Spanish Civil War and his own role in it—and more generally, to integrate his politics with his scholarship—illustrates the disciplinary boundaries of the Hispanism of Rogers' time and, in a larger framework, the political constraints of American intellectual life during the Cold War.

THE ROAD TO SPAIN

Like many Hispanophiles and Hispanists, Rogers felt personally affected by events in Spain since July 1936, which disturbed and infuriated him to no end. When the liberal Spanish statesman Salvador de Madariaga—who, like Ortega y Gasset, claimed to be neutral in the war—visited Oberlin in January 1937 as part of a U.S. lecture tour, Oberlin's president, Ernest Hatch Wilkins, invited Rogers to a lunch with the speaker. Rogers flat-out refused. “I feel so strongly about what is happening in Spain,” he wrote in an explanatory note to Wilkins, “that I have lost all respect for a man who, given honors and responsibility by his country, has, nevertheless, not raised one finger to aid her democracy—the only democracy she has ever had—when it is being fiendishly attacked by international fascism; but who on the contrary has devoted his efforts to trying to show the world that he is one of the very few who can be objective and respect both sides.”¹⁸ The outbreak of the war, he wrote forty years later, “caught American citizens by surprise. Among the most surprised, even shocked, were thousands of teachers of Spanish. And none more than myself.”¹⁹ Madariaga, a Spaniard, might have been shamefully passive; Rogers, although an American, was determined to do his part in defending the Republic. Even though his sabbatical leave for 1936–37 had been suspended—he had planned to spend time in Spain researching the reception of Goldoni—Rogers had Spain, as he wrote, “in [his] heart.” His adopted fatherland beckoned. So, as soon as the spring semester was over, he took the boat to Europe with, as he put it, “the intention of helping the Republican government.”²⁰

He arrived in Paris in the third week of June, ready to continue on south. But the American consul had been instructed not to let Americans

cross the Spanish border, and he refused to grant Rogers a visa.²¹ To his unspeakable frustration, Rogers was stuck. The World's Fair was going on, however, and the Spanish pavilion was preparing to unveil Picasso's *Guernica*, the painting decrying the massive bombardment by German airplanes of a Basque town in April of the same year. Rogers regularly met with Eduardo Ugarte, Luis Lacasa, Juan Larrea, and other prominent Spanish intellectuals, and even did a small translation job for Picasso, providing the English version of the text accompanying the painter's portfolio *Sueño y mentira de Franco*. For the rest, he occupied his time mobilizing friends, acquaintances, and political connections to help him arrange for a visa.

Rogers spent many hours a day reading newspapers and brooding over the future. He was outraged by the efforts of the Right to undermine the legitimacy of Blum's Popular Front government. He was equally angered by the great powers' refusal to stand by the beleaguered Spanish Republic. Much of the diary is taken up with news analysis. His mood was alternately optimist and pessimist. The coming war, which he believed inevitable, filled him with apprehension. He was highly suspicious of Great Britain, which he feared would do anything to protect its imperialist interests, even if it meant allying itself with Hitler. With his characteristic preference for action over deliberation, on July 14, the French national holiday, Rogers participated in a mass protest rally organized by the Popular Front, from which he came away euphoric. "I never saw anything like it," he wrote in his diary that night; "I was proud to be a part of it. Oh, for the day when such a thing will be possible in the U.S., when I can walk down the streets with raised fist and not be in fear of losing my job; when I can walk down the streets with raised fist and others will answer me from the crowd on the sides."²²

Rogers' forced Parisian idleness only increased his thirst for action. So he was overjoyed when, after endless bureaucratic stalling, he was notified in early August that he was allowed to enter Spain as a member of an international delegation, officially representing the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy.²³ On August 8, the delegates took the night train to Toulouse; the next day, they flew to Spain. In Valencia, they met with Prime Minister Juan Negrín and President Manuel Azaña. The latter, who struck Rogers as "congenial, polite and sincere," begged them "that we make clear on returning the nature of the situation here."²⁴ While visiting an orphanage they ran into Dolores Ibárruri, *La Pasionaria*, one of the most charismatic

leaders among the Loyalists. Rogers was awestruck. “She is indeed a supremely dynamic personality,” he noted that evening, “one of the most remarkable I’ve ever met if, indeed, not the most remarkable” (96). The following day, the delegation was given a tour of a prison. Rogers’ chats with the Italian prisoners of war—the living proof of Mussolini’s support for Franco—confirmed his views on fascism: “the mental state of these men was the best proof of the morally disintegrating effect of fascist propaganda in Italy” (100). While he found fascism morally corrupting, however, Rogers was extremely impressed with the Republic’s educational program, which extended even into the trenches (138).

While in Spain, Rogers addressed a couple of meetings; he also wrote a speech that was broadcast to the United States, urging his fellow citizens to support the Republic. “The word democracy,” it said, “so often used by demagogues, has come to have a new meaning because of what is happening in Spain in this tragic but great moment of her history”;

A great lesson comes from Spain to the rest of us in the world who also would like to save democracy. This is the lesson of unity. . . . Unity is being forged to such a degree that it can truly be said that fascism will not prevail. Are we, whom fascism has not yet attacked with its full savagery, going to hesitate in learning this lesson? . . . Spain is in a tragic moment, and here are to be seen the greatness, the nobility, of a people who have known how to suffer. . . . The least, the very least, that we can do is to redouble our efforts for her, win her friends, send her the necessities of life, and make our own democracy recognize that if the fascists win here, it may not have long to live.²⁵

The delegation left after two weeks, its mission accomplished. For unknown reasons, however, Rogers was asked or allowed to stay for an additional two weeks. Judging by his diary, which includes only the first couple of days of this last stretch, he continued his interviews, tours and inspections, visiting, among other places, a women’s prison with family members of prominent rebel leaders, including the sisters of Generals Queipo de Llano and Millán Astray. He finally returned to Oberlin in September, with a large amount of books, posters, pamphlets, and other ephemera, including a manuscript poem about Spain by Langston Hughes and a signed photo of the Republican general José Miaja, the legendary defender of Madrid.

ROGERS AS HISPANOPHILE

The diary confirms that Rogers, like Southworth, Brenan, and Peers, was a Hispanophile as much as a Hispanist. It contains lyrical descriptions of the Castilian landscape, and overflows with admiration for the Spanish people—although he could not help being irritated now and again by the Spaniards' lack of efficiency and discipline.²⁶ But what exactly did Rogers love in the country and its people? What did Spain mean to him? His passion for Spain was clearly tied up with his political beliefs. A child of the Depression, and an active supporter of relief for the have-nots, he admired Spain's *pueblo* above anything else. The article on Spain he wrote for *Fight* shortly before embarking is a full of praise for the Spaniards, but it also argues emphatically that their culture has long been essentially democratic in nature. Its greatness, for Rogers, is fundamentally due to its popular roots, to the fact that it was formed for, through, and by the masses, with hardly any influence from the elite. It was the dogmatism and intolerance of the monarchy, the church, and the army that caused the country's decline, without, however, being able to fully squelch the folk-based fount of its potential. With pungent rhetoric he notes: "The black obscurantism which settled like midnight over all Spain with the expulsion of the Moors in the first days of 1492 could muffle, but not still, that independent spirit of the masses which has always been the deep and throbbing diapason of Spain's cultural harmony."²⁷ Among Spain's most outstanding contributions to world culture are its ballads, "[s]trong and vital and tasting of the salt of the peasant, of the laborer and the soldier," and its Golden Age theater, "the most democratic" of all European drama, and particularly prone to dealing with Spain's own democratic past—"those dark times when king and commoner were one in their battle against the oppressive tyranny of robber barons." A natural high point in this tradition was Lope de Vega's play, *Fuenteovejuna*, in which an entire village rises up in solidarity to avenge the abuses of the nobles, featuring "[t]he mass as hero!" It was the victory of popular taste, which rejected the elitism of the neoclassicists, that signaled the later triumphs of the romantics and *costumbristas*. The Republic—democratic, popular, revolutionary, and an example for the world—was for Rogers, therefore, the real Spain coming into its own. The electoral victory of the Popular Front, finally, signaled the "climax" to the centuries-long struggle between liberalism and dogmatism.²⁸

Such an idealistic reduction of the situation to black-and-white terms would be unacceptable in later studies of the war, but was still a very plausible one in 1937. Nevertheless, even this politically driven love of Spain and solidarity with the Republic do not fully explain exactly why Rogers felt the pressing need to go to Spain in person, in defiance of U.S. neutrality laws, leaving a young family behind. Why this urge to get there as soon as possible and see things for himself? Was his motivation purely personal, or was he encouraged by the American League or another organization? Did he go just to observe, or did he imagine taking a more active role in defense of the Republic? And if he did, was this because his professional identity was so closely connected with Spain, or because of the moral force of his political commitment to antifascism?

The diary does seem to suggest that Rogers feels a moral need to share in the war experience—in the suffering as much as the tension and elation. In Paris, there is a moment in which he considers entering into Spain illegally by boat—a risky enterprise, because discovery might mean a loss of citizenship. Rogers only reluctantly decides against it. “[W]ere I single, I would take the chance with eagerness,” he writes. (Of course, a move like this would also have risked the professional career that he had worked so hard to build.²⁹) Rogers is clearly attracted by the sheer danger and excitement of the battlefield. During a reception at the International Brigade House in Valencia, the group was surprised by “cannon fire and the explosion of bombs.” “The noises startled me no little bit,” Rogers writes, “for I had always heard that aerial attacks were very dangerous; but notwithstanding, I made a leap to the window, for I had come with determination not to miss anything.” The spectacle that unfolds in front of him—searchlight, smoke, explosions—he finds “magnificent” (114–15).

A second question is why, exactly, he wrote his diary, the “Spanish Journey.” Was it purely for personal reference? Did he mean for it to be published in some form or other? Joe Pass, the editor of *Fight*, had asked him to write some more articles on Spain after his return to the United States.³⁰ There are, in fact, several clues in the text that indicate he did write it with a wider public in mind. The text is remarkably impersonal and journalistic—Rogers writes almost as an American everyman, and with an eye to stylistic effect. He is also determined to record factual details. At the orphanage, for instance, he carefully notes the cost per child. Further, it is no doubt significant that he

destroyed most of his personal papers, but decided to donate the “Spanish journey” to the Harry Ransom Center. If he meant the diary, or an elaboration of it, to be read by a wider audience, it is likely he would have hoped for it to be disseminated right away to bolster the Republican cause in the United States. This, too, must have been the impulse behind his urge to collect books, pamphlets, posters, and artifacts from the war.³¹ (On the other hand, for Rogers, collecting might also have been, as it was for Southworth, a way of participating, doing one’s share.) But why, then, Rogers’ sudden silence on his time in Spain so soon after his return home, and his withdrawal into a form of almost entirely apolitical Hispanist work?

A CLOSE CALL

Given what we saw in Chapters 3 and 4, one could argue that David Horowitz is right on at least one point: American scholars used to be more concerned about separating politics from scholarship. Even Rogers’ retreat from political activism after 1939 seems to confirm this tendency. That does not mean, however, that Horowitz’s complaints about the leftist contamination of American academia are particularly new. In fact, academics’ political positions have long aroused suspicion from the outside world. Before the 2006 Pennsylvania hearings, there was Joseph McCarthy, and before McCarthy, there was Martin Dies—the Catholic, Southern Democrat congressman from East Texas who headed up the very first House Special Committee on Un-American Activities, voted into existence in May 1938. Ignoring widespread public skepticism, Dies’ HUAC set to work with zeal, embarking on a dogged, nationwide search for fascist and Communist traitors. Its first hearings were held in Washington DC on August 12; in November, Dies sent two of his six Committee members, Harold Mosier and Noah Mason, to Cleveland to investigate the presence of Communists at Cleveland public schools, Akron University, Ohio State University, Western Reserve—and Oberlin College.

Why Oberlin? The choice was not as obvious as it may seem. The Oberlin College of the 1930s was not precisely the libertarian, left-wing hotbed it is thought to be today. It was still a largely white, WASPy, Republican, and Protestant place, although it did have a vocal leftist minority. In the student straw poll for the 1932 presidential elections, the Republican candidate, Herbert Hoover, came

out winning with 69 percent; the Democrat, Roosevelt, only got 8 percent; but the Socialist Norman Thomas garnered no less than 22 percent of the votes.³² When, in late 1935, Communist and socialist student organizations on U.S. campuses were merged into the American Student Union (ASU)—the college equivalent of the Popular Front—a number of Oberlin students entered the Union’s national leadership structure.

At Oberlin, the ASU found a relatively friendly welcome; and until 1936, the relationship between the Oberlin administration and the local branch of the organization was relatively harmonious. In fact, Oberlin had a thriving Peace Society whose membership included about half of all students. This was, in large part, due to the personal involvement of the college president, Dante scholar Ernest Hatch Wilkins, who was also a prominent figure in the antiwar movement.³³ Given that the progressive student movement of the early 1930s was resolutely pacifist—even, initially, in the face of rising fascism—the administration and the local student Left, including the new ASU, found themselves largely in agreement on the important political questions of the day.³⁴ Most liberals and leftists were convinced supporters of the “Oxford pledge,” determined not to let patriotism lead to militarism, as had happened during World War I.³⁵

The outbreak of the Spanish Civil War in July 1936, however, introduced a wedge between Oberlin’s leftists and the college administration. At a national level, the war also divided the ASU itself. It soon became clear that America’s strict adherence to neutrality vis-à-vis Spain in effect strengthened the position of the fascist military rebels, weakening that of the Republic. The Communist students in the ASU were soon arguing against pacifism and for adopting a more militant antifascist stance under the notion of “collective security”; but they faced strong opposition from other constituents of the organization.³⁶ After a year and a half of fierce debate and precarious compromise, the ASU delegates at the annual convention of December 1937 finally voted to drop the Oxford Pledge.³⁷

At Oberlin, too, the students were deeply divided on the issue of American neutrality, and the local ASU had a hard time defining its position. Meanwhile, pro-Loyalist students and faculty mobilized to discuss the Spanish war, collect funds for civilian victims, and rally in support of the Republic. Paul Rogers gave a talk on campus in October 1936 in which he stated that “Spain is today fighting the world’s battle for democracy.”³⁸ When, in December, the local ASU chapter

attempted to form a committee to “collect funds and medical supplies to be shipped to Spain to help the cause of the Spanish Loyalist forces,”³⁹ a campus-wide discussion ensued about the impact on American neutrality of explicitly supporting only the Republican victims. In the end the local ASU-ers—whose official position at this point was still pacifist—shelved the committee plans.

Again, though, Communist ASU members decided to act on their own account. In the summer of 1937, Paul MacEachron, an Oberlin sophomore, Young Communist, and member of the ASU national executive committee, followed the example of hundreds of fellow students across the country, embarking for Europe to enlist as a soldier in the International Brigades. In early December of that year, the local ASU sponsored a screening of Joris Ivens’s pro-Republican documentary *The Spanish Earth*; and, in January 1938, immediately after the national ASU convention had finally embraced collective security, the Oberlin chapter resumed its debate about the need and legitimacy of aid to Republican Spain. Even though Dean Carl Wittke, a pacifist like president Wilkins, continued to urge the students to aid civilians from both sides, the ASU-ers decided to collect funds for the Loyalists alone.⁴⁰ In March 1938, the campus was shocked to hear that MacEachron, a machine gunner in the Republican army, was reported captured by Franco. Immediately, some three hundred students and faculty sent more than forty telegrams urging the U.S. Secretary of State to act on MacEachron’s behalf.⁴¹ It seems, however, that MacEachron was shot right away.⁴²

It was only eight months after MacEachron’s death, with the Civil War still raging in Spain, that the Dies delegation began its inquiry into Communistic activities at Oberlin and nearby institutions. The *Oberlin Review*, like much of the national and local press, approached the whole issue tongue-in-cheek. This, the student newspaper reminded its readers, was the same House Committee that “this past summer charged that Shirley Temple, child actress, was really just a tool of the Communists.”⁴³ “If you only knew what went on here, Mr. Dies!” student writer Arnold Sagalyn joked in his column:

Our college is a hot-bed of radicalism and is infiltrated with Communistic propaganda! Our faculty contains teachers actively engaged in subversive operations who spread their Bolshevik teachings among their very students! . . . Not only is the college co-educational, which status borders closely on the principle of Communism, but the students

actually practice Communism! Roommates jointly share their wardrobes, co-eds occasionally go out on dates “dutch treat” . . . and it is common knowledge that bicycles in front of the library are regarded as common property.⁴⁴

When it was discovered that Mosier and Mason wanted to interrogate Gypsy Rose Lee, the iconic striptease artist, to ask her about Communists in Hollywood, Lee promised, to great public hilarity, to “bare it all.” Yet, for all the ridicule, the threat was real enough. The *Review* informed that Mosier and Mason had called up “an unidentified Oberlin woman” to testify; that they were considering calling up emeritus professor of Political Science Karl Geiser—a staunch Germanophile who, the week before, had proudly accepted a decoration from Hitler—and that “[s]everal Oberlin students are known to have volunteered information to the Committee.”⁴⁵ “Communists are using us in every way they can to further their own aims,” Mosier warned the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, “and mostly use us as suckers in their money raising enterprises.”⁴⁶

The Dies Committee certainly helped to turn itself into a public joke, but its powers were no laughing matter.⁴⁷ If anyone realized the potential seriousness of the situation, it was Professor Rogers, who had returned from Spain just a year before, and had organized an exhibit of the materials he had brought back.⁴⁸ Like Dies, Rogers was from the South and, like Dies, he had been born in 1900—although Rogers was from an adamantly antiracist family and Dies from a notably racist one.⁴⁹ Rogers, moreover, was precisely the kind of man that Dies and his committee were after. As we have seen, he had long been an active antifascist with close ties to the radical Left. Moreover, several of the political organizations to which Rogers belonged had been targeted as “subversive” by the Dies Committee in the first months of its existence. As it turned out, Rogers was not called up by Mosier and Mason to testify.⁵⁰ On the one hand, it was a lucky escape: Rogers was one of the most politicized Hispanists in the country, and likely the only academic specialist on Spain who purposely traveled there during the Civil War. On the other hand, it is not that surprising that Rogers escaped Dies’ attention, given that his scholarly record contains barely any traces of his trip or his politics.

THE DOUBLE LIFE OF A RADICAL SPANISH PROFESSOR

Given the conservative institutional profile of American Hispanism, what room was there in the field for a radical like Paul Rogers? Judging by his scholarship, not very much. He was a Hispanist and a radical, but not a radical Hispanist. There is little in his publication record that betrays his political position in life; at most, one detects a slight liberal-populist slant. In a short *Hispania* piece from 1929, he calls attention to the progressive opinions in the work of Pérez Galdós: his antimilitarism, his anticipation of Freudian insights, and his suggestions for a league of nations *avant la lettre*.⁵¹ In a 1940 essay on Bécquer, Rogers calls attention to the fact that the young poet was taken for a financial ride by the “schemer” Juan de la Puerta Vizcaíno.⁵² “Grub Street in Spain,” published two years later, expands on this theme, pointing to the difficult socioeconomic circumstances of the Spanish writer through the ages, and his frequent and “ruthless” economic exploitation.⁵³ In the 1950s, Rogers’ long-time friend Stanley Burnshaw—the American critic, poet, editor, and publisher, with whom Rogers shared a political past—asked him to write several annotated poetry translations for the anthology *The Poem Itself* (1960). This assignment allowed Rogers a bit more freedom to focus on the writers he most admired: Antonio Machado and his friend León Felipe, whose obsession with justice equaled Rogers’.⁵⁴ The bulk of Rogers’ remaining scholarship, however, is of the philological, data-accumulating kind, as devoid of politics as possible. He devoted several years to an exhaustive catalogue of Oberlin’s extensive Spanish drama collection (1940); in 1943, he published a book on the Spanish reception of the Italian dramatist Goldoni; he did a couple of short story anthologies⁵⁵; and the latter part of his career was spent assembling an immense dictionary of Spanish literary pseudonyms (1977).⁵⁶

Did Rogers purposely keep his politics out of his research? Or did he not know how to integrate the two, given that there were no real venues yet for a politicized form of humanistic scholarship? The gulf between Rogers’ politics and his work as a Hispanist is likely due to a combination of factors, some personal and others sociohistorical. If, in his thirties, he preferred political action over theory, as a scholar, he seemed to have had a preference for hard data over analysis.⁵⁷ It also seems clear that the separation of politics and scholarship obeyed, to some extent at least, to a sense of propriety on Rogers’ part. Again, Horowitz is right that American academia used to be more scrupulous

in this respect. As we have seen, the notion that scholars should not flaunt their political position—either in their work or in the classroom—was widespread in the 1930s and '40s. For radical faculty, moreover, discretion was seen as a personal and political necessity. As Schrecker explains, “professionalism as well as prudence encouraged [radical faculty] to separate their politics from their teaching. They were, after all, highly trained scholars who, despite their radicalism, shared their colleagues’ commitment to the standards of their calling, in particular its concerns with objectivity and fairness. They believed it was unprofessional to use the classroom for other than educational purposes.”⁵⁸ Even though Rogers was known to have leftist sympathies, and some alumni from the 1930s recall that he liked to talk politics in his classes,⁵⁹ he largely seems to have adhered to these codes of behavior.

But there are also indications that, in a wider sense, he felt constrained and frustrated by the straitjacket of scholarly norms and conventions, which did not allow much room for his social, intellectual, or political aspirations. “For those of us who dedicate themselves to teaching in universities and colleges, the doctorate is a professional necessity,” he wrote in a 1944 letter to a friend in Mexico.

However, I sometimes believe that I am a bit lost. I would have liked to be a writer, not a scholar, and after years of so-called scholarly research, I find myself little satisfied with the result of my efforts. My books are well edited, and their number increases every year. But what bothers me is that they do not say what I want, what I have to say, what I should say. By my count I only have two more to finish, and then I plan on abandoning everything called “scholarship.” What for? I don’t know. It might well be too late for me to engage in writing more stories, or some novel.⁶⁰

The longing Rogers expresses for another kind of writing is also a desire for a stronger integration between his politics and his intellectual work. The summer before, in fact, he had published a short story, translated into Spanish, in the Mexican government newspaper *El Nacional*. Entitled “Ajuste de cuentas” (“Getting Even”), it was a sentimentalized, but relatively successful, attempt at social realism. Set in a small Mississippi town, it tells the story of an African American boy who, taunted by the son of a white family, strikes the kid in the face; the white boy’s father gives the black boy a beating that almost leaves him dead. The text not only makes clear that Rogers was able to

integrate his politics into his writing if he wanted to, but also that he found it easier to do so in genres other than scholarship—and in countries other than the United States.

Toward the late 1930s, Rogers was no doubt aware that the political climate in the United States had become tricky to navigate for leftist academics like himself. If he already thought in 1937 that certain public displays of political beliefs—such as walking down the street with a raised fist—might cost him his job, that threat became all the more obvious after the appointment of the Dies Committee a year later. In any case, it seems quite clear that, soon after his return from Spain, Rogers underwent a significant change. Two things happened: he abandoned all hands-on political activism, and he stopped speaking and writing about Spanish current events. It was as if his trip to Civil War Spain had never happened. Friends, family members, students, and acquaintances all testify that he simply never brought the subject up. It was not until far into retirement, in the mid-1970s, that Rogers began broaching the topic again.

Given the dearth of documentary evidence, we can only guess as to the reasons for this about-face. Of course, his abandonment of activism and his silence on Spain could well indicate some sense of political disillusion. The year 1939, after all, was a hard one for an antifascist Hispanist. The Republic lost the war in April, and in August, Hitler and Stalin signed a non-aggression pact as a result of which the Popular Front coalitions among Communists, socialists, and liberals—including the American Student Union—crumbled almost instantly.⁶¹ Rogers' disappointment might have been crushing enough for him to withdraw from political activism. Another dissuading factor was the sharp increase in widely publicized anti-leftist investigations at the level of local and national government. We already discussed how close the Dies Committee came to the Oberlin campus in the fall of 1938, and Dies was just the beginning. When, in the early 1940s, the FBI launched its first nationwide investigation into the progressive student movement, Oberlin's dean, following the example of academic administrators in scores of other institutions of U.S. higher education, willingly provided the FBI with the names of Communist students, as well as a descriptive history of the local ASU.⁶² Rogers must have been aware of this increasing suspicion, and it might well have influenced his decision to withdraw from the political stage. Throughout the 1930s, he had proudly led rallies, addressed mass meetings, and signed public letters of protest; but when the Citizens

Victory Committee for Harry Bridges asked him to join in September 1942, Rogers replied that even though his “heart [was] with the Committee and its work, as with every democratic effort,” he felt obliged to decline “the use of his name.” He added that his reasons “were not personal.”⁶³

It is in this same period—the early 1940s—that Rogers begins to make frequent and long trips to Mexico (a border crossing for which no passport was needed).⁶⁴ For the next two decades, Rogers went almost every year for at least three months at a time.⁶⁵ In Mexico, he engaged in research projects, spent years assembling slides for a book on colonial architecture, founded a study abroad program for Oberlin, and published an anthology of Mexican short story writers, as well as a book of uncollected poems by García Lorca. But Mexico had an added attraction: toward the end of the Spanish Civil War, the Mexican president Cárdenas had given refuge to some twenty thousand exiles fleeing Francoist Spain. Some of the most prominent among these exiles—politicians, writers, and artists—were already among Rogers’ acquaintances; others became his friends in Mexico. As legend has it, the Republican exiles in Mexico were obsessed with the Civil War and would talk about nothing else. This allows us to infer that Rogers’ vow of silence with reference to the Spanish situation—if he ever took one—did not apply to his long sojourns in Mexico. And we can assume that whatever he felt he could not express at Oberlin, he let out in Mexico. Mexico soon became something of a second home to him—at one point, he seriously considered emigrating. Of course he would not have been the only one: as is well known, Mexico became a preferred hideout for radical American intellectuals who felt stifled by the Cold War climate of the 1940s and ’50s.⁶⁶

A LIFELONG LEFTIST

Still, the years of World War II were something of a respite, providing a welcome distraction from the profound disappointment of the Spanish disaster.⁶⁷ For Rogers, as for many American leftists and supporters of the Spanish Republic, the United States’ entry into war signaled a moment of relief and recognition. Finally, antifascism seemed fully compatible with progressive patriotism. In Rogers’ case, the sudden legitimacy of a leftist, antifascist Americanism seems to have provided a second opportunity to integrate his politics with his Hispanist work.

In 1943, he published a language textbook, *Spanish for the First Year*, which, in addition to the usual grammar review, featured, as reading practice, a series of explicitly patriotic, antifascist, and Pan-Americanist texts. "What is new in this book," Rogers writes in the preface, "is its attempt to present the student with an up-to-date subject matter, with topics and words which form a substantial part of the daily thinking, reading, and speaking of most Americans as their country does its part in the World's great struggle for Democracy."⁶⁸ Among the readings is a text on the World War: "El nazismo y el fascismo son la misma cosa. La Democracia lucha contra el Eje fascista. . . . Es el deber de todo americano ayudar a la causa democrática comprando . . . bonos y sellos" [Nazism and fascism are the same thing. Democracy fights against the fascist Axis. . . . It is every American's duty to help the cause of Democracy by buying . . . bonds and stamps] (17). Other texts deals with the 1942 Pan-Americanist conference in Río de Janeiro, antifascist refugees, General MacArthur ("A hero of the current war" [141]), and foreign enemies. In this last text, Rogers writes: "El Ministerio de Justicia tiene a su cargo el luchar contra los agentes del enemigo. . . . Bajo la jurisdicción del Fiscal General obra el famoso Negociado Federal de Investigación, es decir en inglés, el *F.B.I.* Casi diariamente los periódicos anuncian la detención de extranjeros enemigos" [The Ministry of Justice is charged with the fight against agents of the enemy. . . . Under the jurisdiction of the Attorney General operates the famous Federal Bureau of Investigation, the *F.B.I.* Almost daily the newspapers announce the detention of foreign enemies] (67).

Ironically, it was exactly when this book came out that the FBI opened a file on Rogers and began contemplating his own detention. It seems that it was Rogers' frequent trips to Mexico that had first raised J. Edgar Hoover's suspicion. Given the political profile of the professor's social circle, Hoover assumed that Rogers must work as some kind of liaison for revolutionary organizations in Spain, Mexico, and the United States. In those days of anti-Communist paranoia, a little suspicion was all that was needed for the government to expend massive resources on any single individual, U.S. citizen or not. No efforts were spared to keep on Rogers' trail, and between 1943 and the late 1960s, his frequent comings and goings kept scores of field agents busy. The Bureau would regularly intercept his mail; shadow him on his trips in the United States and Mexico; interrogate his acquaintances; track down his contacts; snoop through his luggage;

and consistently block his passport applications. In the end, none of these efforts produced a single shred of proof. (Nor were all agents particularly capable: amazingly, it took Hoover three years to find out about Rogers' trip to wartime Spain.) In November 1968, twenty-five years and 936 pages later, the FBI decided to close the case.

Throughout this time, Rogers remained a convinced leftist, albeit increasingly of the armchair variety. His letters from the 1960s and '70s to poet friends León Felipe and Stanley Burnshaw show that he remained committed to a radical outlook.⁶⁹ In January 1970, he wrote to Burnshaw that he heard "many intelligent and encouraging things said by young people all over the country," but that he did not "see signs of a united understanding or program." Similarly, in June, he commented that his heart was warmed by student protests at the University of Missouri, where he was teaching that year. However, he had doubts about the students' strategy, given the tremendous strength and resolve of the power structures they aimed to overturn:

the 'student movement' throughout the country seems to me a wonderful thing. But how are they going to change things by working within the system, I don't know and can't believe. The system puts the congressional committees in the hands of the Rivers, the Stennises, the Eastlands, and the Longs. The system must be changed. How it can be changed, I can't even imagine. It is interesting that there is a neo-Marxism building among the country's historians. Will they be able to shed some light on the matter? One thing I feel pretty sure of is that there will be bloodshed and perhaps lots of it. Reagan wasn't joking when he referred to a potential bloodbath, and I am certain that Nixon and Agnew and a multitude of their supporters would just as soon spill blood as not. In fact, I think Nixon is capable of attempting a coup d'état, given the right circumstances, and I've even heard that the military have for sometime had contingency plans for such if the need arises.⁷⁰

After leaving Oberlin College in 1966, Rogers took a number of short-term assignments at other universities until he settled into permanent retirement in Austin, Texas. There, he was delighted to discover the Harry Ransom Center (now the Humanities Research Center [HRC]), with its outstanding special collections in the humanities. Only then, it seems, did he feel ready to revisit his trip to Spain in the 1930s. He opened the dusty boxes with posters and pamphlets that he had brought back with him from Spain, donated them to the HRC, and helped curate a Spanish Civil War exhibit at the Center. He

was, by then, seventy-eight years old, but still an active scholar and fly fisher, as well as a traveler and a *Nation* reader. After four decades of silence, Rogers wrote a couple of memoir-like articles about his own trip to Spain and his Spanish friends in Mexico.

They are curious texts full of strange gaps that show to what extent, for a radical Hispanist of Rogers' generation, there was an unresolved—and perhaps irresolvable—tension between the personal, the political, and the professional spheres of his life. In an article from 1979, for instance, Rogers recounts how he got stuck in Paris after his visa application for Spain was turned down. "I was left with nothing to do but read the papers and attend meetings in support of the Loyalist government," he writes, after which he starts describing one meeting that attracted him in particular. It had "three distinguished speakers: the Duchess of Atholl, Professor Victor Basch of the Collège de France, and the great novelist Romain Rolland." The Duchess was one of the best-known pro-Loyalist spokespersons in England; Basch was a well-known French philosopher who had been a prominent public intellectual and fighter for human rights since the Dreyfus affair. After the Duchess spoke, Rogers writes, "Professor Basch . . . arose and announced that the next speaker was *Le Professeur Paul Rogers des États Unis*." Rogers writes that he was "completely surprised" at this announcement, and scrambled to pass a quick note to Basch saying that he would prefer to address the audience after the next speaker. This he did: "They gave me a French woman who helped me get through what I had to say. . . . Finally I finished and took my seat perspiring, wanting to see and hear Romain Rolland. But the chairman announced that M. Rolland was ill and would not be present."⁷¹

What strikes one about the anecdote, just at the level of narration, is the complete lack of context. How did a well-known figure like Victor Basch know Rogers was in the audience, and why did he call on him? Rogers does not tell us, nor does he even recognize that there are gaps in his story. He does not explain that, as a member of the National Committee of the American League Against War and Fascism and of the North American Committee to Aid Republican Spain, he naturally had been in touch with Basch, who was associated with the *Comité mondial de lutte contre la guerre et le fascisme*, the American League's mother organization, and who moreover headed up the *Comité international de coordination et d'information pour l'aide à*

l'Espagne républicaine. Instead, Rogers prefers to leave his readers guessing.

Time and again in these memoirs, Rogers slyly withholds key information or leaves things purposely enigmatic. In a piece about the Spanish Civil War collection at the Ransom Center, Rogers refers to himself in the third person as “a traveler in Spain in 1937.”⁷² Toward the end of the article cited earlier, he tells us how he finally got to enter Spain as a member of an international delegation. When the rest of the delegation returned after two weeks, Rogers writes, “for some reason the Government asked me to remain for another week or two.” Rogers must know why; he just does not want to tell us. Then he recounts how he departed from Spain with a big roll of posters under his arm. “I left Spain as the only passenger on the plane from Barcelona to Toulouse,” he writes,

Knowing that the French Government was not too sympathetic toward the Loyalists, I was apprehensive about being relieved of the posters by the French Customs Service. When the plane landed I saw a man drive up in a sports car. He was dressed like a “hot shot,” though somewhat plumper than his American counterpart would have been. Also, he seemed in a hurry. He approached me outside the customs building and the following dialogue ensued. I translate it into English.

“What’ve you got there?”

“Posters.”

“What kind of posters?”

“Spanish posters.”

“Okay. Let’s go.”

And that was all.⁷³

Here, the anecdote ends—there is no explanation, just mystery.

This is perhaps a fitting end to a largely conjectural chapter. In Chapters 3 and 4, we saw how the leading American Hispanists of Rogers’ generation tended either to be conservative enough to sympathize with the Nationalist rebellion (Espinosa, Cuthbertson), or extremely hesitant to leverage their academic knowledge of Spain and contribute, in however minor or “objective” a fashion, to the passionate debates about Spain that were raging in the American public sphere (Coester, Doyle). Herbert Southworth was all too aware of the

fact that the American university did not allow for the kind of politicized scholarship to which he had dedicated his life. Indeed, Paul Rogers' career illustrates the serious political and scholarly limitations that existed for academically affiliated Hispanists of his generation. His life was deeply marked by his involvement in the Spanish Civil War as well as his lifelong commitment to progressive politics; but his Hispanist scholarship carries barely a trace of either—and is the poorer for it.

This page intentionally left blank

P A R T I I I



“A BALANCED AND IMPARTIAL VIEW”
BRITISH HISPANISM AND THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 7

“AN HONEST SEEKER AFTER TRUTH”

E. ALLISON PEERS AND THE ILLUSION OF IMPARTIALITY

It was going to be terrific. The Committee for Spanish Relief, a small group of wealthy, influential, and largely Catholic conservatives, felt positively exuberant. Finally, their turn had come. It seemed that the American supporters of the Loyalists—working class organizations, liberal intellectuals, and other leftist riffraff—had had a monopoly on the use of Madison Square Garden for their frequent fundraisers and political rallies. Most of New York, in fact, seemed on the Republicans’ side.¹ The press, too, had been scandalously partisan, refusing to acknowledge the high ideals that had driven the Nationalists to their rebellion. The bombing of Guernica a couple of weeks before had only made things worse. Now all that was going to change, however. It was time for New York and the rest of the country to hear “The Truth about Spain.” Michael Williams, the editor of the Catholic weekly *The Commonweal*, was one of the Committee’s driving forces, and it was he who had conceived of the Mass Meeting at Madison Square Garden, scheduled for May 19, 1937.² He also thought that it would be good to add something more than the usual lineup of speakers—a show of some kind, some theater. The Committee decided to go for a massive, symbolic pageant expressing the infinite suffering of Spain and its people. Williams would write a fittingly solemn hymn.

Williams, the Committee’s secretary general, had been obsessed with the Spanish war for a while. For months now, he had been decrying the anti-Francoist bias of American journalists. In early May, he

had begun writing a series of “Open Letters to the Press,” calling on it to mend its ways. Other Committee members included Ogden Hammond, former U.S. ambassador to Spain (the treasurer and only Protestant);³ Basil Harris, vice president of the International Mercantile Marine Corporation (chairman); Thomas F. Woodlock, the director of the *Wall Street Journal*; and several other prominent figures from the military and the banking world. The Mass Meeting would be the Committee’s first major splash. Edward Knoblaugh, the former AP correspondent in Madrid, was in charge of publicity. The event was widely announced in the Catholic press. Two-column ads were taken out in the *Times*. Cardinal Hayes, the New York Archbishop who earlier had called the Republicans “diabolical, blood-crazed enemies of God and of His Church,” sent a letter to his clergy urging them to send their faithful to the meeting.⁴

Hopes were high; the Committee stated it expected to raise no less than \$500,000. The event was principally meant to collect money for Spanish war victims, but there were plans for later as well.⁵ The Committee claimed to be nonpartisan and stated that the funds it raised would be used to aid civilians “wherever the need existed in Spain,” whether in Nationalist or Loyalist areas.⁶ At other moments, however, it suggested that money would exclusively be “distributed in Rebel territory,” through representatives of the Spanish Catholic Church.⁷ This political ambiguity was typical of the Committee’s workings, and contributed to the controversy that surrounded it from the outset. Pro-Loyalist organizations, including the Spanish embassy, were quick to identify it with the Rebel cause.⁸ In fact, the story of the Committee for Spanish Relief shows how extremely difficult it was for anyone to remain impartial when it came to the Spanish Civil War or, on the other hand, how claims of impartiality were frequently used to mask specific political interests.⁹ This chapter will focus on this particular problematic in the life and work of Professor Edgar Allison Peers, Gilmour Chair of Spanish at Liverpool University, who was specially contracted as the headline speaker at the Mass Meeting on May 19. As a dedicated scholar of Spanish history, literature, and culture and a strong proponent of academic discipline, Allison Peers believed that his mission consisted of the disinterested pursuit of truth.¹⁰ But as a Hispanophile, a conservative liberal, and a devout member of the Church of England, he had a difficult time maintaining his impartiality in the passionate and politicized rough-and-tumble of the British and American public sphere.

A SPANISH PAGEANT

When the big day finally arrived, on May 19, 1937, some 15,000 people gathered at the Garden. In addition to Peers, the speakers included Pierre Crabitès, author of *Unhappy Spain*; Rev. Bernard Grimley, editor of the London *Catholic Times*; Michael Williams; and Rev. Edward Lodge Curran, president of the American Association against Communism and the International Catholic Truth Society. Before handing over the microphone to Peers, Basil Harris, who presided, reminded the faithful throngs that "the committee was not supporting either side in Spain, but was raising funds for use 'on a non-sectarian and non-partisan basis.'" Although he realized that the "sympathies of most of his audience probably were with the Spanish rebels," he urged it nonetheless, "for the night and the occasion," to "have charity toward all in Spain."¹¹ Even the speakers' texts had been revised by the Committee's counsel to make sure they contained no comments of an overly political nature. Apparently, though, aggressively anticommunist positions had been deemed quite acceptable. Thus, Rev. Grimley strongly denounced the Soviet "take-over" in Spain: "The issue is now whether Catholic Spain shall remain Catholic and Spain, or whether it shall become in whole or in part, Soviet Russia. The issue also is God or anti-God."¹² The last speaker was Curran, writer of several pro-Franco pamphlets.¹³ A famed demagogue associated with the equally notorious Father Coughlin,¹⁴ Curran got quite fired up and reportedly made a militant call on those present to exterminate the Reds altogether.¹⁵ The audience was ecstatic.¹⁶

Then the stage was cleared for the night's much-anticipated spectacle: "Democracy Imperiled: A Spanish Pageant." The show featured Hollywood star Pedro de Cordoba as the "Spirit of Spain." An additional 1,500 men, women, and children from various parishes sang in the chorus of choirs or marched in the procession. Michael Williams' hymn summarized the brave Peninsular struggles of the Christian faith—first against the heathens, then against the Moors, then against the conqueror's greed, and finally against Communism: "Now again over Spain, / Hangs the Hammer of Hell, / And the Sickle of the Bolshevik, / And the Anarch's evil spell."¹⁷ The pageant's centerpiece, the role of Spain itself, was played by Mrs. S. Stanwood Menken, a wealthy New York socialite, wife of a prominent conservative Catholic, and mother of a newsreel cameraman wounded in Spain

the previous fall. Ms. Menken appeared on the stage in a lavishly laced, white Spanish dress.¹⁸

Behind its thin veil of nonpartisanship, the event was, quite clearly, a pro-Nationalist affair. How did a distinguished Spanish professor from England, who was not himself a Catholic, but an Anglican, end up playing a central part in this production? The 1,500 participants in the pageant, as well as most of the audience, had been persuaded by their priests. But Peers was a scholar—in a field, moreover, whose American representatives, as we saw in Chapters 3 and 4, preferred to avoid the public debate about Spain. Wasn’t Peers afraid that speaking in public about the Spanish war would tarnish his scholarly reputation?

PEERS AND AMERICAN CATHOLICISM

Peers did not seem too fazed by the circumstances. In fact, his speech was perfectly in tune with the Committee’s modus operandi thus far: apparently neutral, but easily construable as sympathetic to the Nationalists. On the one hand, he stated that the war was a “tragedy from whatever point of view we regard it,” since many people on both sides believed in the traditions that had made Spain great. On the other hand, he minimized the Rebels’ responsibility for the conflict: “For at least five years before it broke,” he said, “one side was ready to spring at the other’s throat. The fact that it was the Nationalists who actually made this particular spring while the Left-wing extremists were only preparing to do so is surely of the very smallest importance.”¹⁹ “I am here,” Peers declared, “to bear witness to my unchanging belief in the virtues of traditionalist Spain and my conviction that peace and prosperity can never return to the land I love until those traditions are once more respected throughout its territory.”²⁰

Peers was not unknown to the American Catholic public. Since 1930, he had been an occasional contributor to *The Commonweal* with articles on Spanish Catholicism, and his book on the Second Republic, *The Spanish Tragedy*, had been positively received in Catholic circles. His arrival in New York was duly covered in the papers. A couple of days before the Mass Meeting, Peers had explained to the press that he was convinced that the majority of the Spanish people were “faithful to the traditions of their ancestors” and thus conservative rather than leftist by nature. Franco, he explained, was “generally welcomed in the three-fifths of Spain he controls.”²¹

The day before, he said that while both sides had committed atrocities, "the evidence adduced against the Reds seems to me more convincing and damning than that against the Whites."²²

Financially, the Mass Meeting was an outright flop. Instead of the hoped-for harvest of half a million dollars, a week after the event only \$21,000 had been raised, barely enough to cover expenses, which included Peers' trip and honorarium.²³ In the months following, Williams' editorials became increasingly strident, abandoning any pretense of nonpartisanship. In another open letter to the press, he derided the *Herald Tribune* for calling the Spanish government democratic, while in reality it was "a gang of notorious cutthroats and Communists and Anarchists." "What ought to be done with the men in the Valencia and Madrid government," he added, "is to hang the lot of them; although, of course, those precious scoundrels will have airplanes handy in Valencia to escape."²⁴ Compared with Williams and other militant Catholic opinion makers in Great Britain and the United States,²⁵ Peers' articles in the *Commonweal* employed a relatively moderate tone, although he, too, would occasionally lash out at the Republicans. What seemed to irk him more than anything was their lack of respect for Spain's religious traditions. In early May, writing again for the *Commonweal*, he had expressed his concern over the fact that Easter could not be celebrated in Loyalist-controlled territory. "[T]here can be no peace" in Spain, he wrote, "for as long as one-third of the country is held by the enemies of religion." While the Spanish Civil War had drawn a sharp line of division between Protestants and Catholics in the United States and the United Kingdom,²⁶ Peers himself had no doubts about the need for ecumenical solidarity. "As I think of all that the Church in Spain has done for me," he concluded, "I cannot . . . allow it to be attacked without protest. From it I have learned what heights can be reached by fervor, devotion and sacrifice: the very lessons of Holy Week."²⁷

Who was Peers, really? Why did he, an Anglican, feel compelled to defend the Spanish Catholic Church? How could he claim to be an impartial scholar and yet let himself be featured prominently at massive pro-Nationalist rallies?

LIFE OF A HISPANIST PIONEER

In 1937, E. Allison Peers was Britain's best known Hispanist. Born in 1891 at Leighton Buzzard in Bedfordshire as the only son of a Customs

and Excise officer, he had spent his childhood moving around the United Kingdom. Considered too delicate a child to withstand the rigors of boarding school, he accompanied his parents in their nomadic life. He had an early interest in languages. At age twelve, he began learning French. The possibility of relatives' moving to Peru sparked a first interest in Spanish. He entered Christ's College at Cambridge in 1909 with the idea of studying both French and Spanish, but his tutor told him he better do French and German. There was not even a lecturer in Spanish.²⁸ Peers ended up taking First Class Honors with distinction in Medieval and Modern Languages in 1912, followed by his Teacher's Diploma a year later. Studying Spanish, it turned out, was something he had to do for himself. So it was in the years after Cambridge that Peers, working as a schoolmaster, formed himself as a Hispanist and scholar.²⁹ His first attempt at original scholarship, *Elizabethan Drama and its Mad Folk* (1913), received the Harness Prize. Peers had discovered a vocation. In 1919, he decided to pursue an academic career.

In March 1919, he undertook a long trip to Spain—the first in a lifelong series of yearly pilgrimages, only interrupted during the war years—which confirmed for him his deep affective bond with the country's languages and culture.³⁰ When the University of Liverpool announced the vacant Gilmour Chair of Spanish, Peers boldly applied, although, as an amateur Hispanist, he had little more to show for than “a vast enthusiasm, a good Spanish accent and a quite considerable acquaintance with the country's literature.”³¹ He got a first foot in the door in January 1920, when Liverpool hired him as Junior Lecturer in French and Spanish, and after a series of complications he was appointed Chair two years later.³²

The Gilmour Chair at Liverpool was one of the two existing Spanish chairs in Britain at the time, one of the highest posts for any Hispanist to achieve. The self-made professor was fully aware of his pioneer status in an academic discipline still largely to be developed.³³ Peers quickly revealed himself as a tireless promoter of Spanish learning throughout the nation. Shortly after arriving at Liverpool, he had established a Summer School of Spanish with courses at Liverpool and Santander. In 1923, he founded the quarterly *Bulletin of Spanish Studies*, followed in 1934 by an Institute of Hispanic Studies. He was also instrumental to the foundation of the British Hispanic Council in 1943, serving as its Educational Director for the first three years. Peers' institutional legacy, then, is considerable.³⁴ The *Bulletin*, now

published in both Liverpool and Glasgow, is alive and well, as is the Humanities Research Association that Peers founded in 1918.³⁵

His scholarly legacy is also important, albeit less enduring. His three fields of specialization were romanticism, mysticism, and Catalan culture. Throughout the thirty-two years of his scholarly career, Peers kept up an astonishing level of production, resulting in a steady stream of articles, books, and translations. His most well-known scholarly books are *Ramon Lull: A Biography* (1929); *A History of the Romantic Movement in Spain* (1940); and three volumes of *Studies of the Spanish Mystics* (1927, 1930, 1960). Overall, however, his work is broad rather than deep, and stronger on exposition than on analysis. Rather than revolutionary insights, the greatest merit of Peers' tremendous scholarly efforts—befitting perhaps of a self-taught pioneer—was to have opened up whole fields of Spanish and Catalan cultural, literary, and religious history to a wide Anglophone readership.

The topics and emphases of Peers' scholarship manifest the nature of his Hispanophilia, which, as we will see in a moment, was largely based on an image of Spain as a uniquely romantic and devout nation.³⁶ Peers' treatment of Spanish literature is also limited by the relative rigidity of his moral-religious framework. His work on the mystics, for instance, shows his unwillingness to broach the more repressive aspects of the history of the Spanish Catholic Church and the morally transgressive aspects of mysticism itself.³⁷ On the other hand, Peers' vision of Hispanic studies as an academic discipline was remarkably broad, and he emerged as one of the early promoters of Portuguese, Latin American, Catalan, and Basque studies.

PEERS AS PUBLICIST

For all the importance he attached to scholarly research, Peers was strongly dedicated to promoting Anglo-Hispanic relations in the broadest sense. This included fostering the teaching and learning of Spanish and Catalan, but also trade and travel. From early on, Peers published belletristic impressions of his own yearly trips to Spain, in which he gave free rein to his Hispanophile musings. Many of these texts were first published in his *Bulletin* and later gathered in travel guides such as *Royal Seville* (1926) and *Granada* (1929). He also used the *Bulletin*—not initially conceived as a learned journal³⁸—to keep the British public apprised of political and cultural developments

in Spain, largely through news summaries. Starting in 1930, with events in Spain growing increasingly turbulent, Peers became something of a Spanish correspondent for British newspapers and magazines, assuming an important public role as an expert voice on Spanish current affairs. In the ten years between 1934 and 1943, he published seven books and around fifty articles on contemporary Spain in newspapers and magazines, in addition to countless lectures on the topic and twenty-five articles on Spain in the *Bulletin*. And, despite his constant claims to objective expertise, Peers came to occupy, in the eyes of his Anglophone public, a clearly defined political position with respect to Spanish politics.

In what follows, I will try to sketch the evolution of this position between 1931 and the mid-1940s, as manifested in Peers' prolific production as a publicist. I will argue that Peers moved from an initial moderate liberalism in 1931 to quite a reactionary stance in the second half of the Spanish war, back to a more moderate posture toward the end of the World War II—a curve not unlike that described by British Catholic opinion with respect to 1930s Spain.³⁹ The two most remarkable features in Peers' political evolution are the widening disparity between Peers' image of himself as an objective, dispassionate scholar and his increasing public reputation as a pro-Franco partisan; and the extent to which Peers' being swept up in the political tidal wave of the Civil War ended up tarnishing his scholarly prestige, estranging him both from fellow scholars and from those political constituencies that had long seen him as an ally. In the end, however, Peers' view of Spanish politics was, at all times, rooted in his Hispanophile investment in a very specific notion of Spain and the Spaniards.

But first we have to say a few words about Peers' relationship to the Catholic media. As is well known, almost all of the Catholic press in Britain and the United States declared itself in favor of the Nationalist cause soon after the outbreak of the war (albeit with varying levels of fervor), and, in particular, after news spread of the violent attacks on the church and the clergy in Loyalist territory.⁴⁰ Peers was a devoutly religious man. Although a practicing Anglican himself, he had strong affective ties to Spanish Catholics, spending much of his yearly four-month trip to Spain in churches and monasteries. He had a good relationship with Roman Catholics at home as well: they were naturally more interested in the fate of Spain than other sectors of the British population, and Peers' work on the Spanish mystics had raised his profile in Catholic circles. Thus, it is not surprising that his career as a

prominent publicist was largely made possible by the generous welcome he received from Catholic editors in the United Kingdom, Ireland, and the United States. Among Peers' main non-scholarly outlets were the Jesuit quarterly *Studies*; the respected Catholic weekly *The Tablet*; the *Dublin Review*, a London monthly founded and edited by clergy; the Catholic newspaper *The Universe*; and the *Commonweal*, edited by Catholic laymen in the United States. At bottom, Peers' relationship with the Catholic media was largely symbiotic. For the Catholics, Peers' contributions, generally in agreement with the journals' editorial lines, offered the prestige of an ostentatiously independent (because non-Catholic) academic expert on Spain. For Peers, the Catholic press provided access to a wide, transatlantic audience that, in turn, resulted in exposure, book sales, speaking engagements, and prestige.

Peers' prolific production on contemporary Spain from 1930 on also indicates that, unlike his American colleagues, he saw no reason why a scholar should refrain from public debates on fraught political questions within his area of expertise. For Peers, the principles of academic work—which he liked to define as “the disinterested cultivation of scholarship and love of uprightness and truth”⁴¹—did not command a withdrawal from the public stage. To the contrary, Peers believed it was the academic’s duty to correct misinformation when and wherever it occurred. And the more public interest in Spain was aroused, the easier it seemed for nonexperts to mischaracterize the country’s situation and, worse, make false claims to knowledge.⁴²

THE SECOND REPUBLIC (1931–36)

Peers' response to the peaceful proclamation of the Republic in April 1931 was largely optimistic. Although he liked both King Alfonso XIII and Miguel Primo de Rivera, who ruled Spain as a military dictator from 1923 to 1930, Peers, like many Spaniards—or British Catholics for that matter⁴³—saw the change of government as a sign of hope. Given that he had been a staunch admirer and advocate of Catalan language and culture since the beginning of his career, and had long seen Spain as a nation of nations, he applauded the regional autonomy granted by the first Republican government. He also appreciated the Republicans' plans, particularly their commitment to education and agrarian reform. At the same time, however, he was

extremely wary of the left-Republicans' anticlericalism. For Peers, Spain was a quintessentially religious nation. To deny that fact, as he believed the Republicans were doing, was not only to suppress a unique heritage and to invite violent reactions, but also to destroy Spain's only hope for recovering its former greatness. And if there was one thing that Peers desired for the country he loved, it was future glory. As a man who cherished social discipline and order, he was also appalled at the increasing political chaos of the five Republican years and the loosening of social and moral structures, particularly in class and gender relations and public norms of conduct.

Although Peers admired Manuel Azaña's statesmanlike conviction and strength, he thought that the reformism of the left-Republican governments of 1931–33 was dangerously out of touch with Spain's true cultural and religious identity.⁴⁴ Worse, the Republicans proved unable to control the "mobs" whose "ungoverned passions" they had done much to unleash. Peers therefore welcomed the conservative turn of November 1933, although he lamented the absence of solid rightist leadership.⁴⁵ He was also increasingly apprehensive of political polarization. "The true cause of Spain's present troubles is the pendulum," he wrote in late 1934; "It is difficult to realise in England how violent the pendulum-swing can be in a country which by tradition goes to extremes, in whatever direction."⁴⁶

Peers' general view of the five Republican years is reflected most clearly in *The Spanish Tragedy*, finished shortly before the outbreak of the war. On the face of it, the book provides an overview of political events largely based on the news summaries in the *Bulletin of Spanish Studies*, giving more attention to the actions and motives of individual politicians and parties than on underlying social or economic factors—let alone the changing situation, worldview, and aspirations of the population at large. Still, Peers' political position is easily visible below the book's fact-based surface. His account is based on a set of conservative and simplistic premises, the first of which is that the Spaniards are an essentially religious people strongly wedded to tradition. This is why, Peers argues, Spain could never accept Communism, "a system completely out of accord with its own deep-rooted traditions."⁴⁷ The people's attachment to tradition also explains the chronic failure of the Republicans' anticlerical politics: "Attempt after attempt is made by the enemies of religion to attack it or expel it from the minds of the people, and again and again the people themselves instinctively defend it and secure its victory" (70). The second premise is somewhat in

tension with the first: Peers suggests that the Spaniards' collective character—"not so democratically inclined as most other nations in Western Europe"—makes them a difficult people to rule. When not governed with a strict hand, they easily succumb to indiscipline and violence.⁴⁸ And although, in general terms, "the best in them can be brought out by effective leadership" (2), they have been tragically burdened with a chronic dearth of "good government" (vii).

Third, Peers is strongly wedded to social order. He almost automatically labels breakdowns of order as "disturbances" or "riots" at the hands of "extremists," the "mob," or other "disruptive forces" (his term for oppositional working class movements) that are driven by "brute," "ungoverned" "passion" and "fury." Here, the Spanish professor's limited view of politics comes to the fore. It did not occur to him, for example, that strikes and other forms of protest could have a particular motive or justification. They are always a nuisance—"disconcerting" (147), "uncomfortably common" (60)—and, therefore, always something to be prevented and suppressed. If, in the Republican years, strikes occurred with "disagreeable frequency" (13) and in "monstrous succession" (96), it was simply because the government was too weak to impede or curb them.

His discussion of social unrest in the Andalusian countryside manifests a similar social naiveté. To be sure, Peers acknowledged the problem of absentee landownership and massive estates. He also spoke of the fact that low wages had caused "discontent and distress among agricultural labourers," although he seemed unwilling to connect their lot with any notion of exploitation. If the laborers rose in strikes, demonstrations and revolts, it was not because of their social and economic position, but because of the nefarious influence of radical politicians on an illiterate populace (99). It is *ideas* that are the real problem: "the rapid (perhaps over-rapid) improvements in communications have facilitated the spread of subversive doctrines among uneducated villagers" (87). Incidents like the tragedy at Casas Viejas were "due to the violent action of subversive ideas upon the simple minds of little educated and unsophisticated peasants" (129). Hence, the reestablishment of social discipline by the forces of order (the "loyal" police or the army), with whom Peers automatically identifies himself and his implied reader, is always welcome and necessary. Reimposition of order is also inevitably violent, and the measure of force employed is for Peers a direct function of the level of resistance displayed by the "mob." State violence against the lower classes, then, is almost always

assumed to be purely reactive, not provocative. Thus, things got so bad in Barcelona that “machine guns *had to* be installed in the principal squares”; in Asturias, martial law “*had to be*” proclaimed; in Madrid, the Telephone Exchange “*had to be* charged by mounted police”; a miners’ strike “made it *necessary* to take military action,” and so forth.⁴⁹

As he covered the Republic’s political ups and downs, Peers had a hard time hiding his increasing exasperation at the Spaniards’ apparent inability to steer a middle course. He desperately desired to infuse Spanish political life with some good English—or even Catalan—common sense, giving Spain “a policy combining steady progress with respect for the best Spanish traditions and a complete renunciation of retaliatory measures.”⁵⁰ As “chaos” mounted, however, Peers became progressively defeatist. He saw no way out but a violent one—and, he feared, the harder the pendulum swung one direction, the harder it would swing back. Still, the outbreak of the Civil War took him by surprise.⁵¹

THE CIVIL WAR AND THE EROSION OF IMPARTIALITY

The widespread British interest in the Spanish Civil War propelled Peers to even further public prominence. The flood of news, facts, and opinions on Spain that was suddenly inundating the British public sphere impelled the professor to crank up his mainstream media production to unprecedented levels. In September, *The Spanish Tragedy* came out (he had finished it before July) and became an immediate bestseller. Peers’ publications began to appear in a great variety of journals and newspapers. In addition to the Catholic periodicals mentioned earlier, he wrote articles and book reviews on the war for the *Daily Telegraph*, the *Liverpool Daily Post*, the *Contemporary Review*, and the *Birmingham Post*. And while the media landscape seemed more polarized every day, Peers tried his best to maintain his status as an impartial expert. “I write . . . as a close and independent observer,” he had written in 1933, “spending several months each year in Spain, and endeavoring to obtain a balanced and impartial view . . . [aspiring], above all else, to be a persevering student of things as they are and an honest seeker after truth.”⁵² “While complete impartiality is always difficult of achievement,” he wrote three years later in the preface to *The Spanish Tragedy*, “I have tried to describe the events of

these years with all possible objectivity" (x). After July 1936, however, objectivity became all but impossible to maintain. It was not only the politicized environment that dragged Peers toward one corner of the political spectrum, but the outlets that requested or accepted his contributions, as well as the organizations that mobilized his authority for their purposes, were largely associated with the Nationalists. And as events in Spain escalated, the Professor himself, too, for all his claims to disinterestedness, could not help feeling emotionally affected and politically prodded. He was, after all, a Hispanophile as well as a religious man. "The last few weeks," he wrote in September 1936, "have been intensely painful for all who believe in Spain's future."⁵³

Nevertheless, his written statements during the first six months of the war tended to be moderate and dispassionately realistic. To be sure, the war was a tragedy; but it was hard to see where else developments in Spain over the past years could have led. Both parties were equally to blame for the outbreak of hostilities. And since both sides represented extreme and intolerant positions, a straight victory of either would be catastrophic. Above all, Peers kept telling his readers and listeners that the situation in Spain was much more complex than the media made it seem. As an example, he repeatedly mentioned the awkward position of the Catalan and Basque conservatives, particularly the Catholics, who, as strong supporters of regional home rule, found themselves allied with political groups with whom they had very little in common beyond a shared opposition to Franco's Castilian centralism.

In the first half of the war, in fact, it seems that it was largely Peers' love of Catalonia and his principled adherence to democracy that kept him from openly siding with the Nationalists. In September, he stated that he "could not side with a military revolt against a Government so recently elected by popular suffrage."⁵⁴ ("But," he added, "it is quite another thing to urge that we should support the Spanish Government against the rebels."⁵⁵) In November 1936, Peers attempted to explain to the *Tablet's* educated, socially minded Catholic readership that Catalonia really was inhabited by people who did not "feel themselves to be . . . primarily 'Spaniards.'" They had legitimate reasons to be wary of a Nationalist dictatorship unwilling to compromise on Spain's territorial unity. This also explained the fact—so strange for the *Tablet's* readers—that some Catalan Catholics were siding with the godless anarchist and Communist hordes. He went on to explain, however, that the Popular Front's support base was equally fragmented and

contradictory, as the government had lost much adherence among “liberals and independent progressives.” Many of the educated supporters of the Franco camp, Peers pointed out, were “not Conservatives or Fascists but Liberals—Liberals who have fled from a Government that has forfeited all claim to be respected as democratic.”⁵⁶

For a short time, it seems, Peers had good hopes for a quick Nationalist victory. In the manuscript for an article written some three months into the conflict, when Franco had been making such good progress that the war looked about to end, he wrote that he “hoped and believed” Franco’s victory—that is, a Nationalist dictatorship—would bring “[p]rospects of peace and progress.” A Loyalist triumph, by contrast, would certainly have resulted in “a long period of dissension, disruption and anarchy.” “One shudders to think,” Peers writes, “what would have happened if these men had become the rulers of the new Spain.” The bloodshed would have simply continued, as the anarchists would have quickly and violently dispensed with all of their enemies, including moderate socialists.⁵⁷ When Franco failed to take Madrid in November 1936, however, it became clear that the war would not be over any time soon. For a while, Peers reverted back to his more neutral position. In January 1937, he predicted that the fighting would go on for another three years, and that the only hope for peace was a negotiated settlement of some kind. “I do not support either side in the struggle,” Peers wrote. “The only way in which [Spain] can have peace and prosperity is to find a middle path between the Right and Left avenues.”⁵⁸

By early 1937, *The Spanish Tragedy* had gone through five editions. Around March, Peers prepared the sixth, expanded version, now including an account of the first six months of warfare. As in the first edition, the conclusion was ambivalent, combining extreme pessimism with a sense of hope against all odds. Spain’s immediate future was “indescribably dark,” Peers declared. “Slaughter and counter-slaughter seem the only prospects. . . . Men are at each other’s throats. Civilization has given place to chaos. And there is one ‘martyr of the Republic’ above all others—Spain.” But even after six months of disaster, Peers decided to stick to the declaration of Hispanophile faith with which he had closed his first edition:

Yet I believe in Spain, as firmly as I have believed in her in the past, and I believe that the millions of her citizens who still place country above party will in due time, in a re-united and prosperous Spain, have their

reward. . . . [N]obody who knows Spain . . . can have the smallest doubt as to the intrinsic greatness of her people. If Nature has endowed her with riches, history has crowned her again and again with enduring laurels. . . . For she still retains those essential virtues without which, in the old warlike Europe, she could never have enjoyed her splendid past; and those same virtues, in the new Europe, now struggling, like herself, in the throes of rebirth, will give her a still more splendid future.⁵⁹

PRO-FRANCO OR NOT?

Peers' failure to take a clear stand in favor of either the Republican or the Nationalist cause confused many a commentator. While stating time and again that he, unlike most other public figures, had *not* taken sides, in practice, he found that the press and the public had long placed him squarely in the pro-Nationalist camp. How sincere, at this point, were Peers' protestations to the contrary? In truth, of course, Peers' position vis-à-vis Spanish politics was never actually "impartial" or "objective," but always complex and continually evolving. While never fully on the Nationalist side, I would argue that he came closest to an unequivocal pro-Franco position between mid-1938 and the end of the war. It is then that his two main reservations about the Rebel camp—its repressive, totalitarian tendencies and its anti-region-alism—are weakest, and his hopes for the *caudillo* strongest.

Peers' prominent role in the May Mass Meeting, along with the likes of Curran and Grimley, indicates that, by the spring of 1937, he had already begun his journey into the Nationalist camp. While, in an unpublished piece written for *The Commonweal* in April, Peers had still declared that "there can be no question of siding with one party or the other or of assigning the entire responsibility to one side or the other," he had also stated that in terms of atrocities the "Reds have by far the worse record." Moreover, while in Loyalist Madrid and Barcelona "churches are closed, secularized, desecrated or burned down altogether," in Nationalist Seville and Burgos "not only is trade good and secular life prosperous but full freedom is allowed to religion."⁶⁰

In the same month, Peers took it upon himself to explain Franco's vision of "the new Spain" for the Catholic readers of the *Dublin Review*. While a Loyalist victory would immediately result in the collapse of the Popular Front and another violent civil conflict, Peers was

much more optimistic about the prospect of a Nationalist triumph. Franco's "New Spain," Peers writes, constitutes "a not unattractive picture of tomorrow against a carefully drawn picture of yesterday and today."⁶¹ Peers goes on to provide a detailed overview of the Nationalists' view of Spain's past and future. To be sure, he writes, "I cannot myself pretend to any enthusiasm for a totalitarian State, a régime of repression and the abolition of Home Rule in two regions in which huge majorities of the inhabitants have voted for it." Yet, Peers hopes that moderation and peace will arrive with time, and that, in any case, "normal methods of government will for a considerable period be impracticable" in a Spain ravaged by war. In other words, Peers is willing to accept, for the time being, a sacrifice of democratic principle for the sake of stability and the retention of Spain's traditional values. The Gilmour Professor is genuinely enthusiastic, on the other hand, about Franco's commitment to the well-being of the working classes and his general views on the social question, which reject "suicidal and destructive class strife" and emphasize discipline and responsibility. "[W]e must believe in the sincerity of General Franco's desire to exalt work and to improve the lot of the worker," writes Peers; and "it is a good omen that General Franco abhors the parasite."⁶²

JOINING THE NATIONALIST SIDE

In the fall of 1937, Peers began to openly express his preference for a Nationalist Spain over a Loyalist victory. Even for the "religious . . . patient and pacific" Catalans, a right-wing dictatorship was preferable to an antireligious revolution. Peers believed that after an initial period of repression, Franco might well soften his stance,⁶³ thanks to the conservative leaders of the Lliga Catalana, some of whose exiled leaders had drawn quite close to the Nationalists. For Peers, the solution to the "regional question" was the key to Spain's future well-being,⁶⁴ but so was the preservation of its religious tradition. By the end of 1937, he believed Franco could provide for both. Here, Peers was likely influenced by his close relationship to Joan Estelrich i Artigues, friend and former secretary of Lliga leader Francesc Cambó, both of whom had expressed their support for the Nationalists. Estelrich, exiled in Paris, ran a pro-Franco journal, *Occident*, and coordinated, with Peers' help, the publication of pamphlets denouncing the anticlerical violence in Loyalist territory.⁶⁵

By late 1937, Peers was widely seen as one of the most authoritative defenders of Franco in the Anglo-Saxon world.⁶⁶ The Loyalists certainly recognized him as an enemy. In November 1937, he received an angry note from the Republican press-attaché in London: "No one sows confusion among the English public so efficiently as you," it said. "And since it seems that in your actions you are quite aware of the harm which results to Spain, I am forced to say that of all the pens which are now so busy writing on Spanish matters here in England, yours is undoubtedly the most contemptible."⁶⁷ Similarly, an otherwise very positive review of *Catalonia Infelix*, Peers' account of Catalan history and the nation's struggle for autonomy, points out that in the section covering the Civil War, "the author's sympathy with the antidemocratic forces becomes so obvious that, unfortunately, the sound treatment of the preceding period is overshadowed."⁶⁸ Nevertheless, as late as May 1938, Peers insisted that he was "no partisan on the political issue."⁶⁹

In later years, this intimate association with the Nationalists became something of an embarrassment for Peers, who did his best to minimize its importance. When, in July 1942, the editors of the London *Catholic Herald* described him as "stout champion of the Nationalist cause," Peers felt obliged to correct them:

I ought to say that this I have never been. I have fought, and will always fight, for Christianity; and, during the Civil War, when the left-wing extremists were (as it seemed to me) attacking Christianity, I could not contemplate their victory with anything but horror. But a Nationalist victory seemed to me less desirable than an agreed solution, though there were indications that General Franco, whom I personally respected, might attempt to bring Spaniards together and pursue a policy of gradual reform. But he has not done this. My hope therefore, is that Spain will evolve a democratic regime—whether monarchy or republic—based on Christian principles, granting to Spaniards the same freedoms as we all demand for ourselves, admitting the principle of autonomy for regions that desire it and making a genuine effort to solve her grievous and ever-present social problems.⁷⁰

"At the beginning of the Civil War the Republicans claimed me as an ally and quoted me freely for some time," he wrote two months later to the writer and amateur Hispanist Charles Duff, who during and after the war published a pro-Loyalist newsletter: "Then, when it became clear that I was not on their side they wrongly assumed that I

was on the other side. The Nationalists, having such incredibly feeble propagandists of their own, insisted upon adopting me, but again and again I have stated categorically that I am no more their whole-hearted supporter than I was that of the other side.”⁷¹ Given what we have seen thus far, these protestations seem insincere. More interesting is the fact that, in neither of these two statements, Peers makes any more claims to his impartial or objective expertise, on which he had insisted so much while the war was still going on. If, in the conclusion to *The Spanish Tragedy*, his Hispanophilia had revealed itself as an important driving factor and a source of inveterate optimism (“I believe in Spain”), he now confesses to a strong ethico-religious commitment as well: “I have fought, and will always fight, for Christianity.”

* * *

In the course of 1938, Peers further bolstered the Nationalist cause with a string of articles, books, and pamphlets. In a piece on “The Evolution of the New Spain” in the January issue of the *Dublin Review*, he declared that a Nationalist victory would result in a “speedy pacification,” and that the “high standard of order prevailing under Nationalist rule”—most strikingly manifested “in Seville . . . where indiscipline and disorder in the months before the war were phenomenal”—was “a hopeful and encouraging sign of the future.”⁷² Peers also believed Franco would bring prosperity: “There will be wages for all, social justice for all, an end to class strife.”⁷³

In an essay on Spanish church history published later that year in the American journal *Thought*, he stated that a Loyalist victory might well lead to “an attempt . . . to eliminate Christianity [in Spain] the likes of which the world has not yet seen.” “And let us pray,” he concluded, “that Spain—the Spain of crusaders, mystics, and saints—may never again know the horrors of Communist and atheist rule!”⁷⁴ In a little book entitled *The Church in Spain, 1737–1937*, Peers formulated a forceful defense of the Spanish clergy—“the best friends of the Spanish people”—in the face of Loyalist and Protestant accusations of corruption, illicit wealth, and betrayal of Christian values.⁷⁵ He also emphasized the important role in the recent “suffering” of the church of “proletarian movements” that shared a “disbelief in, and denial of, God.”⁷⁶ In *Our Debt to Spain*, Peers aimed to prove that the country’s “great and splendid past has been intimately bound up with her faith”—a point tirelessly hammered on by the Nationalists. “She was

greatest," Peers writes, "when she was fighting for a sacred ideal. . . . Her people, bred for generations in their fathers' faith, are surpassed in devotion and loyalty to their religion by no people in Europe. . . . The body of Spain may be racked with suffering, but the heart of Spain is still sound."⁷⁷ The book's polemic prologue, a patchwork of Peers' own words and segments from speeches by Generals Franco and Mola, was one of the strongest explicit endorsements of Franco Peers had made yet. Peers, who had always defined himself as a convinced democrat, seemed by now willing to tolerate and even endorse Franco's plan to organize Spain along "broad totalitarian lines." Peers was frank about the public relations aspect of his book, which he hoped would help ease conservatives' qualms about Franco's fascistic tendencies, and "increase the number of those who, whether or not they approve of the particular form of government likely to succeed a Nationalist victory, wish that the efforts of all Spaniards who are determined, at whatever cost, to retain the treasures of their past may be crowned with success."⁷⁸

THE NATURE OF PEERS' HISPANOPHILIA

It is not surprising, then, that Peers was widely seen as one of Franco's most prominent apologists in the English-language media, at least in the second half of the war. It was an image that would haunt him for the rest of his life, and that has persisted to this day. Several recent Civil War studies directly classify him as pro-Nationalist⁷⁹; scholars also regularly confuse him for a Catholic.⁸⁰ The reality is more complicated, though. Peers was never a full-blown Francoist. Although he believed the Republicans were, on the whole, mistaken in their methods and assumptions, he did recognize their sincerity and courage, and genuinely admired many of the writers and intellectuals on the government side, including Antonio Machado, Luis Cernuda, and Azaña.⁸¹

Why, then, the two years' worth of almost purely pro-Franco positions? Of course, political polarization often makes for strange bedfellows. More important is the close interconnection between Peers' Hispanophilia and his political views. In the end, one of the crucial factors determining Peers' position in the Spanish Civil War was his affective and moral investment in a particular image of Spanish culture, history, and character. As an English Hispanophile, he appreciated

those things that, in his mind, made Spain different from his own country. Peers' early travel accounts in the *Bulletin* show that for this lower middle class, self-made British man with a genuine religious vocation and a conservative disposition, Spain represented, above everything else, a source of aesthetic and spiritual gratification, even inspiration. Peers' first reports on the country frequently represent the Englishman's experience in sensory terms. The Spanish language was an acoustic delight;⁸² the people were graceful and good looking; the cities and the landscape were equally stunning.

This experience was further enhanced by the visitor's awareness of the country's intense spirituality. Spanish culture was suffused with centuries' worth of deeply lived religious devotion. As a high Anglican and lay preacher, Peers had a tremendous appreciation and admiration for the Spaniards' past and present piety, as well as their commitment to the core values of Catholicism, which, for him, provided the key to the country's past and future greatness. He could only envision a glorious, prosperous, and peaceful Spain that did not break with its commitment to religion, but, to the contrary, built on it; one that provided all its classes with a good life, but did so without upsetting the social structure as such; and one that recognized the United Kingdom as a longtime friend and ally. In the end, it was Peers' investment in this image of Spain as essentially Catholic—together with his boundless admiration for the country's religious history, and his belief that Spain's only road to future greatness was the traditionalist one—that made it impossible for him to support the modernizing, secularizing project of the liberal Republicans.

Peers' earliest writings on the country reveal the more narrowly political dimension of his Hispanophile investment in a religious, traditionalist Spain, which was also the quintessence of order, peace, and serenity—a warm bath for an English soul that did not find full satisfaction at home. If Peers' own modern England was the busy, sunlit, dusty street, Spain was the equivalent of a quiet church, a spiritual place inviting solitary meditation. It was a space that allowed the lonely worshiper to surrender to his nostalgia for those glorious days “when the dogmas of the Church were more real to men than their daily business.”⁸³ Impressions of this kind suffuse Peers' first travel book, *Royal Seville* (1926). The Spaniards, here, are for Peers a model of grace and good behavior. Even their wild *fiestas* are quite harmless. The Holy Week processions leave Peers speechless. “I have never in any country seen such devout and worshipful congregations as in

Spain," he writes. During the processions, "the crowd spirit is there, but controlled by tradition and faith."⁸⁴

As Malcolm Read has pointed out, the climax of Peers' literary-religious pilgrimage to Seville is his entry into the city's cathedral:

As arresting as the hollow, vault-like coolness of the incense-laden air which strikes his brow is the majesty of those wide naves, with their gigantic pillars rising into the immensity of the unknown; the dim light which filters through the fourscore darkening windows; the preternatural stillness of the temple, deserted by all save perhaps a few unseen, belated worshipers in some far chapel; the calm, broken only by the faintest murmur, which is all the distance records of a last evening rite. Caring not to move, the traveller stands hushed before the work of man, in presence of the glory of God. This moment he will never recapture. In the mystical sense which is truth, he is ALONE.⁸⁵

In the end, Read writes, going to Spain allowed Peers to enter "an organic, pre-individual, pre-capitalist community, comparable to the 'merry England' of contemporary English critics such as F. R. Leavis, but in the case of Spain, refreshingly real, surviving, that is, into the twentieth century."⁸⁶

ORDER, DISCIPLINE, FAITH

Peers' complex and evolving positions on Spanish politics not only derived from his affective investment in Spain as an essentially religious country. They were also grounded in a worldview whose three key ingredients were order, discipline, and faith. For Peers, social order was sacred, as was respect for tradition, which, in his view, should always guide any project for progress and reform. Workers' and peasants' demands for better living conditions, if reasonable, should be met, for the simple reason that Christian charity demanded it. But Peers strongly disapproved of any attempt on the proletariat's part to change the larger social structure. Of course, this narrow view of society could not but limit Peers' understanding of contemporary Spanish history, particularly the social aspirations of the working-class and peasant movements.⁸⁷ At bottom, Peers' Hispanophile vision of the Spaniards as a devout, tradition-loving, and courageously faithful people did not allow him to recognize the undisciplined anarchist and socialist mobs as really Spanish at all. Peers' Hispanophilia and

sociopolitical views, then, were closely intertwined. His attraction to things Spanish was, at least in part, an attraction to a particular form of social organization. For Peers, Spanish culture, precisely because it was so suffused with religious tradition, had a uniquely missionary potential, exemplified most clearly in the Conquest and Reconquest—but this missionary potential was also, at the same time, a unique potential for social *disciplinarity*: a model of social organization that promised to achieve progress for all without social disturbance or an upset of natural hierarchies.

It is hard to exaggerate the centrality in Peers' ethics of discipline in the widest sense. For Peers, discipline is a key notion not only in the context of religious practice and devotion, but also of education, social and intellectual self-betterment, and even in the individual's development of the capacity for independent thought (not necessarily linked to independent action). Peers' commitment to progressive projects is spurred by his attraction to discipline, but also limited by it. His appreciation and endorsement of a good part of Spain's liberal-progressive intellectual tradition, ranging from Lull to Giner de los Ríos to Azaña, is informed precisely by what he sees as the disciplinary potential of their educational enterprises. Yet, as soon as Spanish progressive thought begins to conceive of individual and collective forms of emancipation as independent from or—worse—in *opposition* to tradition (that is, religion and authority), Peers feels obliged to register his disagreement.

Hence, too, his ambivalent reactions to the reformist Republican project. For those northerners who, like Peers, idealized Spain as a romantic-religious *locus amoenus* of sun, grace, peace, order, and devotion, the plans of the first Republican government of 1931 must naturally have been a rough wake-up call from a piously meditative dream. It did not take long for Peers to understand that it inaugurated the end of the *control* of the “tradition and faith” that he had praised in his text on Seville. For Peers, the strikes, revolts, and frequent changes of government that characterized the Republican years were all the more objectionable because he saw them as antithetical to Spain's true self. To make things worse, the arrival of the Republic had a negative effect on public morality. During the first year, Peers wrote, there was “a noticeable increase of ebullience, especially in streets and public places, among the young of both sexes,” which later “degenerated into the most shameless and disgraceful license.” Peers similarly believed that the sharp increase in “mendicity, with its accompanying

mendacity," was due to "the greater independence and indiscipline which came in with the Republic."⁸⁸

Peers' notion of discipline also provides the link between his ideas on scholarship and the university and his views of religion and society. In all three of these realms—the scholarly, the religious, and the social—collective order emerges as a fundamental good, less a means than a goal unto itself, and one that is achieved at the individual level through steadfast faith and discipline. As far as religion is concerned, of course, order, faith, and discipline are central to the structures of church and belief; social and ecclesiastic order reflect the order of God's universe, an order whose ultimate legitimacy resides in the believer's faith in His goodness. The believer's mental and physical discipline, meanwhile, are not only the behavioral manifestations of faith and respect for divine authority, but also the primary means of deepening that faith.

In the realm of scholarship, faith takes a slightly different shape: it is manifested in an unconditional, disinterested love of truth for its own sake. Peers developed a comprehensive vision of scholarly research and the university as an institution during the years that he was barred from visiting Spain. Writing as Bruce Truscot, whose true identity he carefully hid, Peers published two influential books in 1943 and 1945 that helped reshape the landscape of British higher education in the years following World War II. Although there is no space here to go into Peers' spirited advocacy for provincial, "red-brick" universities such as Liverpool and Manchester, the Truscot books do make clear to what extent his views on scholarship were informed by his views on religion. As Read points out, Peers' definition of the university's mission as the disinterested pursuit of truth owes less to liberal than to religious thought. The university is, for Peers, like a monastery; and the scholar's work is as severed from the secular world as that of the monk: "The very lifestyle of the university, in Truscot's view, should be contemplative in the religious sense, and far removed from earthly, political concerns."⁸⁹

In the realm of society at large, finally, faith is manifested for Peers in a fundamental belief in the legitimacy of the bourgeois state as a guarantor of social order.⁹⁰ Social discipline takes the shape of the obedient and moderate conduct of all social classes, particularly the less privileged ones. Of course, everything possible should be done to improve the latter's living conditions—but never at the expense of social order. Peers' debt to classical liberalism is evident in his

conception of emancipation as a process that takes place at the mental and individual level—emancipation as a civilizing process, a form of *Bildung*, really—and one that should never lead to a change in the structures of power. To the contrary, in his view, emancipation—that is, education—is premised, precisely, on a fundamental *respect* for the teacher’s authority, and a modeling of the teacher’s capacity for discipline. “What university teachers can do for working people above anything else,” Truscot writes, “is to initiate them into the habits of disciplined thought which they themselves have formed and which govern all their activities.”⁹¹ It is this same respect for authority that marks the limits to Peers’ commitment to democracy as a principle of social decision-making. Quick to reject any emancipatory project based on collective action and a questioning of authority, he held a deep, instinctive loathing for socialism, Communism, and other movements aiming at the political advancement of the working classes. In Peers’ case, these political allergies applied to Spain as much as to his native Britain. In fact, one cannot help think that Spain served, in some measure, as a screen onto which Peers projected certain social and political desires that he thought were not, or no longer, realizable at home. Of course, cultural *philias* often arise from an awareness of a domestic lack and the need to look elsewhere for fulfillment.

In the Protestant, modern, industrialized, and democratic Britain of the 1920s and ’30s, Peers was not the only one to feel a lack of this sort and to cast longing glances to the south. As it turns out, Peers’ intellectual generation proved particularly receptive to the structures and values of the Catholic faith, producing a number of prominent converts, including Graham Greene, Evelyn Waugh, Arnold Lunn, and G. K. Chesterton. Many of these intellectuals tended toward some kind of Hispano- or Latinophilia (Chesterton’s admiration of Italy has been mentioned already), idealizing those countries around the Mediterranean in which Catholicism and its values were not marginalized as they were in Britain, but fully integrated into society and state. According to Tusell and García Queipo de Llano, the attraction among these intellectuals to Catholicism and the Mediterranean was frequently rooted in feelings of disaffection and nostalgia, a rejection of “the modern world and its civilization,” and a concomitant “idealization of the remote past, identified with another culture and also with another religion.”⁹² Politically, this stance tended to imply a strong rejection of “godless” socialism and Communism but not always a rejection of liberal democracy.⁹³

This analysis accurately captures the political ambivalence of the nostalgia-inspired Hispanophilia of which Peers was the most prominent and accomplished scholarly representative in Britain. When, in the polarized context of the Civil War, it came to a black-and-white choice between Catholicism or democracy, the Franco camp proved a much more acceptable choice than the “anti-God movement” of the Loyalists. However, if Peers placed his hopes on the *caudillo*, it was because he believed his authoritarianism would, with time, lead to peace, prosperity, and a return to an orderly democracy. In this democracy, he hoped that a strong and sensible leader would instill social discipline among all classes, and would do so through charisma and vision, rather than repression. When this did not happen, Peers was deeply disappointed. He was also forced to adjust his opinion of Spain’s head of state. This, in turn, cost him the favor of many of the Catholic conservatives who had come to see him as their ally. It is safe to assume that this was a painful process for Peers, especially because it took him a while to realize his mistake.

DOUBT, DISAPPOINTMENT, AND A NEW FAITH IN DEMOCRACY

Franco, as is well known, declared victory on April 1, 1939. Peers, who had not been to Spain in three years, returned for a visit in August. His brief stay confirmed his confidence in Franco’s leadership and wisdom. In two reports for *Studies*, Peers explained that his visit had been an altogether pleasant one, in spite of the horror stories that were being told about postwar Spain. Crossing the border had been easy; the food in the hotels was good, and “[t]ea shops sold cakes of all kinds in abundance.” More important, the Spaniards were still their old selves: “No visitor to Spain who knew it in the old days need fear that close contact with foreign nations during the War has in any way changed the character and habits of the people.”⁹⁴ The new regime proved surprisingly moderate. Nor did the Nationalists relish their triumph: “I sensed no elation of victory—a satisfaction, rather, that the traditions so long and so deeply revered were safe, a relief that the struggle to preserve them was over.”⁹⁵ More important, Peers saw no evidence of massacres, large-scale blacklisting, or undue influence from German and Italian forces.⁹⁶ To the contrary, Peers believed that even if Spain decided to enter the World War, it would be on the side

of the Allies. Postwar rebuilding in all areas was proceeding apace, and Peers expressed his belief that Franco's approach to the country's much-needed "moral reconstruction"—based on a rigorous exclusion of the defeated—was a prudent one: "There can be no doubt that General Franco is acting wisely in aiming at a gradual rather than an immediate reincorporation into the national life of those whose sympathy with the present *régime* is doubtful." With respect to political prisoners, meanwhile, Peers reported that the government was "doing what it can to make their lot easier."⁹⁷

In the year following, however, disappointment began to set in, as Peers became increasingly suspicious of Spain's continued support of Nazi Germany. He was also annoyed with the constant Brit-bashing in the Spanish press and among Spanish politicians. Reporting in his *Bulletin* on the regime's lavish commemoration of the 1808 war of independence against Napoleon, for instance, Peers could not help note, with some irritation, that the speech by Ramón Serrano Súñer completely ignored the British role in that war.⁹⁸ Peers, to be sure, remained deeply committed to Hispano-British relations, but to his chagrin, British gestures of friendship—favorable loan agreements, among other things—were not responded. The tension between Peers' patriotism and his Hispanophilia became increasingly painful.

By late 1940, Peers' support of Franco had seriously eroded. In *The Spanish Dilemma* (1940), he had still expressed his hope that Franco would be wise enough to keep his distance from the Axis and recognize Britain as the friend it was.⁹⁹ By mid-1942, these hopes had gone. In July, he bluntly declared that the Spanish government had "failed" in its efforts at "moral reconstruction." Peers strongly believed that a generous form of amnesty for the regime's political enemies was the only possible first step toward national unity and reconciliation. But Franco had refused to go that route. "All this," he writes with reference to the regime's ruthless policy of repression, "is a sign of inflexibility, of rigidity—in fact, of *rigor mortis*. Whether death was the result of hardening of the arteries or of poisonous inoculations administered by Falange Española a *post mortem* by the people will no doubt in time determine." Rejecting Franco's vision of postwar Spain, Peers surprisingly advocates for a Third Republic, nothing less than a reprise of 1931.¹⁰⁰

Spain in Eclipse (1943), which completed Peers' month-by-month account of the Civil War, reads like a record of his personal frustration with the dictator. While, in 1938, Peers had not seemed to approve or

disapprove of Franco's plan to organize his new Spain along "broad totalitarian lines," Peers now declared that Spain's "only prospect of salvation" lay "in a democratic *régime* which is in the broadest sense liberal." Although he still admired Franco's ability to reinstate unity and order in a strongly divided nation, Peers could not forgive him for his ruthless revenge on the vanquished. To let the Socialist Julián Besteiro perish in prison, or to execute Lluís Companys, were acts of unnecessary cruelty.¹⁰¹ For the first time, too, there is an unmistakable undertone of contempt in his characterization of the *caudillo*. "[O]ne of the traits of this phase of Spanish history of which the Spaniard of the future will be least proud," he writes, "is the ridiculous adulation heaped upon the conscientious and well-meaning little man on whom the untimely deaths of his senior officers had bestowed the rank of Supreme Figure-head."¹⁰²

Peers' changed position vis-à-vis the Franco regime and his call for a Third Republic were met with surprise and disappointment in the conservative Catholic circles that continued to support the "Gentle General."¹⁰³ In fact, around this time, Peers almost ceased to publish in Catholic periodicals altogether. Meanwhile, his scholarly reputation had not emerged unscathed from his intense involvement in the Civil War debates either. As is clear from his exchange with Duff and the *Catholic Herald* cited above, he continued to be seen as a Francoist sympathizer. It must have been in part Peers' awareness of the political baggage that, by now, had become attached to his name that made him decide to publish his books on British higher education under pseudonym. His strident stances on Civil War Spain had tarnished his reputation as an impartial scholar. Too many sectors of the intellectual, political, and educational establishment viewed him with suspicion, if not rancor.

In fact, the years in which Peers made headlines as Bruce Truscott also marked the decline of his prestige as a Hispanist. Peers had always been an outsider. Although he was known to be tremendously dedicated to his students, he was a fastidious and impatient man with obsessively efficient working habits who had a hard time hiding his disdain for many of his less productive and disciplined colleagues.¹⁰⁴ As we will see in Chapter 9, his work as a pro-Franco publicist further served to estrange him from the other prominent Hispanists of his generation.

More tragically, Peers failed to leave as strong a mark as he would have wished on the new generations of Hispanists, with the exception

of his own disciples. It was during and after World War II that British Hispanism became fully professionalized, and many of the field's younger leaders signaled a marked departure from Peers' school. While Peers had specialized in romanticism and mysticism, the new generations preferred to focus on the Golden Age and Baroque. Peers' brand of archive-based literary history, moreover, was rejected in favor of close textual analysis. Peers, who himself had been a rather ungenerous reviewer, was now being repaid with the scorn of his younger colleagues. When, in 1949, he published a shortened version of his monumental history of Spanish romanticism, Bruce Wardropper, a British Hispanist twenty-eight years his junior, wrote a caustic review in *Modern Language Notes* that dismissed Peers' scholarship as hopelessly marred by prejudice, self-indulgence, and a general lack of professionalism.¹⁰⁵

As we saw in our discussion of American Hispanism, after World War II the presence of Franco, a fascist anachronism in postwar Europe, posed a tricky problem for foreign scholars of Spain. Peers, too, seemed at a bit of a loss. In these years, his production on contemporary Spain in the mainstream media shows a significant drop—a sign of the public's decreased interest in the country as much as of Peers' soured relationship with the Catholic media that long provided him with a platform. In 1946, Peers had resumed his yearly visits to Spain, witnessing its slow recovery from the war under a dictator whose position continued to grow in strength thanks to international politics, the population's passivity, and the divisions among the opposition. Peers continued to do whatever was in his power to foster Hispano-British relations, and to call for more teaching of Spanish at all levels of British education, although he increasingly invoked the importance of Latin America for British political and commercial interests. From 1943 to 1946, he assumed the post of educational director of the newly founded British Hispanic Council.

Peers' trips to Spain, meanwhile, were increasingly marked by frustration and irritation. Ironically, he was among the first to decry the potential havoc wrought by mass tourism on his beloved summer refuge. In a bittersweet report on a visit to Mallorca in 1951, a year before his death, he laments what the foreign "hordes" have done to the home of Ramon Lull: "Palma is irretrievably ruined. . . . But the worst of all is Valldemosa, formerly an unspoiled little town. . . . In the old days one wandered about this at will. . . . To-day lines of motor-coaches queue up at the monastery gates, to disgorge their occupants,

who are marshaled round church, cloister, and cells, to the accompaniment of a quick-fire commentary in indifferent French, with a high-pitched 'English resume' for those who desire it."¹⁰⁶ Peers still relished to be alone in Spain, and was happy to report that there continued to be "many places . . . still quite unspoiled." At bottom, however, he had to admit that the Franco regime had not only failed to bring true peace to Spain—that is, one based on reconciliation and tolerance within a general respect for tradition—but that the prosperity Franco had promised spelled the destruction of the "unspoiled" Spain with which the professor had fallen in love back in 1919. Ironically, of course, he had had a hand in bringing this situation about through his efforts to stimulate British travel to the country, and his initial defense of Franco's "New Spain."

Even the awareness of the threats of international tourism and trade did not affect Peers' lifelong commitment to improving relations between Britain and his adopted Iberian fatherland. His misgivings about the Franco regime, however, now obliged him to minimize the importance of politics to those relations. In a letter to the London *Times* in 1951, he made yet another appeal to his countrymen. For the past fifteen years, he said, "political partisans," "often knowing little or nothing of conditions in Spain or of the Spanish character," had interpreted events in Spain "in light of their own opinions." But the "civil war . . . ended 12 years ago"; "the present régime is firmly established; and conditions in Spain, although far from ideal, have been steadily improving." "Spain's concern to-day," he concluded, "is not with ideologies but with realities."¹⁰⁷ Meanwhile, his *Bulletin* increasingly turned its focus toward Latin America, as indicated by its 1949 name change into *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*. Soon after Peers' death in 1952, the journal, which had for so long been largely Peers' personal enterprise, adapted itself to the newly professionalized disciplinary landscape. It appointed an editorial board, and turned itself into the kind of "learned review" that Peers had never meant it to be.¹⁰⁸ In the end, Peers' legacy was an ambivalent one. He left Hispanism with a tremendous institutional infrastructure, and did more than anyone of his generation to promote it as a serious scholarly discipline. But, as it turned out, by the early 1950s, the field had outgrown its autodidact, Hispanophile founding father.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 8

“SPAIN IS MY COUNTRY, REVOLUTION OR NO REVOLUTION” LOVE AND POLITICS IN GERALD BRENAN

A curious pair of exiles from Spain arrived at Plymouth on October 22, 1936. Like most of the hundreds of thousands of refugees that would end up leaving wartime Spain, these two had been expelled from their home by violence and fear. Forced to abandon their possessions, they were overcome with anxiety and nostalgia, and did not know when they might return, if ever. Only one thing made them different: they were not, in fact, Spanish. Still, Gerald Brenan and Gamel Woolsey, the Anglo-American writers’ couple who had been driven from their house in Churriana near Málaga by the advance of Nationalist troops in Andalusia, displayed many of the symptoms of intellectual exile. They lost sleep over the fate of those who had stayed behind, and were tormented with survivor’s guilt. They devoured the newspapers. They threw themselves into frenzied political activism. And they felt an irrepressible urge to write about their traumatic experience, to explain to the world what was going on. Woolsey, who had been born in the United States and had married Brenan some five years earlier, published her wartime memoir, *Death’s Other Kingdom*, in 1939. Brenan took longer to get his book out, but it had an enormous impact. Its title was *The Spanish Labyrinth*.

Exile has been known to thwart promising careers, but it can also serve as a catalyst for the discovery of unexpected vocations. This was Brenan’s case. It was the outbreak of the war and the forced return to his homeland that turned him into a Hispanist—one of Britain’s best.

By 1936, he had lived in Spain intermittently, for a total of some seven years. He had moved to Yegen, a small Andalusian town, after the end of the First World War. His main purpose was to read and learn—he brought two thousand books in hopes of providing himself with an education and, perhaps, becoming a writer. But he did not plan to write about Spain. When the Civil War broke out, he had not really published anything about the country. Although he had described his life in Spain in his correspondence with his English friends, become an avid reader of Spanish literature, and begun a biography of St. Teresa of Ávila, he had not integrated into Spanish intellectual life. His Spanish relations were limited to his servants and fellow villagers. Nor had he been particularly interested in Spanish politics. It was not until the weeks following the Popular Front victory in the elections of February 1936 that Brenan caught the political bug. It quickly absorbed him completely. He also began keeping diary notes with the idea of turning them into a book.¹

Still, he did not initially see much reason to worry about his safety. When a conservative acquaintance from Málaga told Brenan in the beginning of July that a military coup was imminent, Brenan thought “the whole thing [would] be put down quickly with little bloodshed.”² Reality proved different. Brenan, who happened to be running errands in Málaga on July 18, witnessed the first reactions to the attempted military coup. Partly inspired by the example of his friend Jay Allen, the American newspaper correspondent and friend of Herbert Southworth’s who lived in nearby Torremolinos, Brenan decided he wanted to write about Spanish events for a wider British audience.

Among other things, Brenan was appalled by the stories that his fellow British expatriates from Málaga were telling the English papers about supposed left-wing atrocities. Having investigated these accounts and found them false, Brenan thought it his duty to set the record straight. In late July, he sent a brief report to his friend Bertrand Russell, who had just spent six weeks with him in Spain. Russell forwarded it to the English press as an anonymous letter “from an English friend who has lived many years in Spain . . . and is well qualified to form a judicial estimate of the present situation.” The missive was duly published in the *Manchester Guardian* and *The New Statesman*. Interestingly, the *Statesman* printed Russell’s note alongside another letter on “Atrocities in Spain” from a certain George Beaton—the pseudonym under which Brenan had published his first two books. In this way, Brenan accomplished the rare feat of having two letters to the editor

published simultaneously, side by side, although none of the two identified him as the author. Both of Brenan’s anonymous texts were combatively pro-Loyalist. “This is not a struggle between Fascism and Communism,” the note to Russell said, “but a struggle for liberty against tyranny.”³ The Beaton letter was more ironic. Describing Rebel General Queipo de Llano’s cruel radio broadcasts, with their “drunkard’s jokes and insults and menaces,” Beaton writes: “No. Decent conservatives must stop there. There are certain people so nasty and so infamous that one would not like even with a stick to touch them.”⁴

With Russell’s help, Brenan got the *Manchester Guardian* to appoint him as a special correspondent in Spain in early August.⁵ His first dispatch, dated August 3, was published in two parts on August 12 and 13. Here, Brenan’s tone is more dispassionate and pondered; gone are Beaton’s ironic sneers and the ardent denunciations of Russell’s “English friend.” Like other journalists covering the Civil War, Brenan had to strike a careful balance between political advocacy and factual reporting.⁶ Adopting different personae was one way to do that. For Brenan the newspaper correspondent, the need for journalistic discipline seems to have tempered his explicit commitment to the Republican cause. Alternating a careful inventory of facts with considered background analysis and personal musings on Spanish culture and character, the *Guardian* dispatches, in many ways, prefigure *The Spanish Labyrinth*. Brenan’s idiosyncratic style manages to convey a sense of honesty, logic, and moral acumen. Thus, although in his first report he details the “methodical arson” that destroyed some shops and houses in downtown Málaga, he also underscores that churches and convents were left unharmed and that, initially, “[n]o one was killed and there was no looting” because stealing ran counter to Spanish workers’ honor.⁷ Moreover, “[i]f one is horrified at the material destruction—and much of it is, of course, perfectly stupid—one should not forget the provocation.”⁸

What baffles him most is the attitude of the upper classes. When a rich lady complains to him about the poor (“The people are so uncultured. They do not know the value of art.”), Brenan, who has lived among Spanish peasants for years, has to control himself not to burst out in a romantic-populist tirade:

“But what about your shooting at them,” I wanted to say, “and destroying their liberties? What about your hideous villa? Have you ever

noticed their fine manners, listened to their peasant philosophy, so full of experience of life, or looked at their pottery or their glass painting? Have you ever considered their natural intelligence and their splendid vitality?" As her husband was in prison I did not say this. But it was clear that no amount of shooting and massacring by triumphant generals would upset her so long as Spain was made safe for her class.⁹

In a typical counterpoint, Brenan goes on to emphasize that the peasants and workers "have just the same streak of violence and fanaticism as the other classes." Still, his heart goes out to them; it is they who possess "a humanity, a simplicity, an idealism, and a quick intelligence which I find the most attractive things in Spanish character."¹⁰ Brenan and Woolsey left for Gibraltar on September 7, going on to England on October 19.

The Civil War not only turned Brenan into a writer on things Spanish. It also forced him to translate his life's philosophy into explicit political terms, in spite of his naturally apolitical temperament. Although he had always had a strong ethical sense, he was remarkably devoid of deep convictions in matters of political and social organization. In the mid-1930s, he had remarked to Ralph Partridge that he would not be averse to a military dictatorship in Spain because that would make the country "easier to live in."¹¹ Once the war had broken out, however, Brenan realized that it was impossible not to take sides. But even when he chose for the Republic, he reasoned like an Englishman. In his autobiography, he later confessed that he disliked the military rebels from the outset, but that he first doubted whether he should take any side at all "in the domestic affairs of a foreign country." When he finally sided with the Loyalists, it was because he felt they were the more decent and civilized lot, but also because he thought that a fascist Spain would threaten British military interests. In the last instance, it was his English affection for the underdog that pushed him over into the Republican camp.¹²

Returning to England only fueled Brenan's obsession with Spain. Reading about the Nationalists' mass shootings of civilians drove him crazy. "I cannot bear to go on thinking about these things, yet cannot get them out of my mind," he told his friend Helen Anrep in January 1937.¹³ The war made him "almost ill with anxiety and emotion," he later told V. S. Pritchett: "I lay awake at nights, had paroxysms of fury, scribbled letters to the press and only cured myself by hard work in the British Museum."¹⁴ Brenan now became an outspoken

pro-Republican activist. He addressed rallies, raised money, spoke to politicians, and wrote letters to the press. Yet, in the same way that his first letters and dispatches on the war alternated advocacy with pondered analysis, Brenan also felt an urge to read and write about Spain in a different, more dispassionate way. Soon, his initial idea of an eye-witness book on the war evolved into an infinitely more ambitious project: a scholarly study of its root causes. Until 1936, Brenan had been just another British Hispanophile. The military uprising had made him politically committed to the Republican cause. But when the emotions aroused by the war became unbearable, Brenan’s remedy was to temper his Hispanophilia and commitment with scholarly discipline, spending long hours at the British library, and at his desk, reading and writing.

It was an effective therapy. As Jonathan Gathorne-Hardy writes, “to explain was to exorcise.”¹⁵ Brenan had first hoped to publish his book—initially titled *The Reason of Unreason: A History of the Struggle in Spain, Past, Present and Future*—right away to help bolster the Republican cause. But he was unhappy with the first draft, finished by early 1938, and decided to start over.¹⁶ When Franco declared victory on April 1, 1939, Brenan was still busy rewriting and revising what was now growing into a manuscript of more than 150,000 words, although he interrupted his work for a letter-writing campaign on behalf of Spanish refugees.¹⁷ When *The Spanish Labyrinth* finally appeared, published by Cambridge University Press in March 1943, it revolutionized British Hispanism. World War II was in full swing; Brenan had joined the Home Guard.

* * *

Before analyzing the *Labyrinth*, let me outline my main arguments for this chapter. Brenan, I submit, presents an especially fascinating case of the interaction among Hispanophilia, commitment, and scholarly discipline. I will make two specific points. First, I suggest it was the particularly propitious, balanced interaction among these three elements that allowed Brenan to produce, in just five years’ time, *The Spanish Labyrinth*—his most remarkable work by far, and responsible for a paradigm shift in British Hispanism. Until then, most, if not all, British accounts of Spain had been written within the paradigm of national character.¹⁸ The outbreak of the Civil War only reinforced commentators’ tendency to explain events in Spain as driven by the “Spanish genius.”¹⁹ The *Labyrinth*, by contrast, escapes the national

character straitjacket. It insists on explaining the Spanish situation, in the widest possible terms, as the product of complex evolutions in the country's history, economics, sociology, culture, and climate. But while Brenan's work transformed Hispanist scholarship,²⁰ it was also important in political terms. By explaining the situation in Spain as the product of a complex but contingent set of historical circumstances, Brenan implicitly leaves room for the possibility of positive, progressive change in Spain.

My second main argument is that the ideal balance among Hispanophilia, commitment, and discipline that led to the *Labyrinth* broke down soon after the book's publication. Brenan's interest in politics slackened, as did his commitment to scholarly rigor. But his love of Spain did not. For the rest of his life, his writings on Spain, as well as his political attitude toward the country and its people, were increasingly driven by his Hispanophilia—that is, by his affective investment in Spain as a country fundamentally different from England (and closer to his own worldview), as well as by his desire to live in that country. After 1945, Brenan's Hispanophile sentiment not only caused him to relapse into a fundamentally romantic and nostalgic preoccupation with Spanish national character, but also forced him to come to terms with the need to live under, and with, Franco's dictatorship.

THE SPANISH LABYRINTH

The *Labyrinth* was Brenan's third published book, but it received far more attention than *Jack Robinson* (1933), published under pseudonym, and *Doctor Partridge's Almanack for 1935* (1934). The *Labyrinth* was widely reviewed, in almost universally positive terms. J. B. Trend, Chair of Spanish at Cambridge, called it a "learned and penetrating book."²¹ Ralph Bates considered it "an absolutely essential work."²² The book's success is not hard to explain. In addition to being extremely well written, it also filled a void. As Jonathan Gathorne-Hardy points out, the Spanish war was still fresh in the public's memory, and readers were eager to understand its background.²³ Predictably, the only notes of criticism came from conservatives. Allison Peers liked only one third of "[t]his rather curious book." According to Peers, the author "appears to have no understanding of, and therefore no sympathy with, the attitude of the Spanish traditionalist,"

while “the tone of his last chapters is often that of the propaganda-sheet.”²⁴

The *Spanish Labyrinth* is, in effect, a detailed social and political history of Spain from 1874 to 1936, with special attention given to the agrarian question and the anarchist movement. As such, it covered largely uncharted territory. Some work had been done in Spanish, but no one in any language had ever attempted anything of this scope and ambition.²⁵ In several ways, Brenan’s book set a new paradigm in the English-speaking world for thinking and speaking about Spain. For one thing, he made clear that it is hardly possible to speak about “Spain” in the singular: regional differences were vast, not only in terms of geography and climate, but also of language and culture. Spaniards, moreover, identified primarily with their town or region.²⁶ Second, Brenan argued that the country’s single largest problem was the structure of its agriculture—particularly the *latifundios* in the South and the *minifundios* in the North, both of which were marked by inefficiency and social injustice (87; 91–92).

Brenan’s book also broke with the tendency to see Spain solely in terms of cultural stereotype.²⁷ When the Civil War broke out, British partisans of one side or the other in the conflict had great difficulty making their respective cases to the public. Both camps quickly opted for rhetorical efficiency over nuance, taking recourse to stock images of Spain and the Spaniards. The Black Legend, the legacy of British-Spanish rivalries in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, painted the Spaniards as a cruel, backward, and barbaric race. The romantic myth of Spain, fueled by British solidarity with the Spanish revolt against Napoleon, presented the Spaniards as a heroic, chivalrous, and honorable people whose decadence was due to bad government. The combination of these notions provided the British Left and Right with a ready-made moral framework for explaining the war to their constituencies. For the Left, the Rebels represented the black Spain and the Loyalists the romantic heroes; for the Right, it was the exact opposite.²⁸

Brenan’s single most impressive feat was that he managed to move beyond this simplistic explanatory model, and that he did so in spite of his sympathy for the Republic and the repulsion he felt for the Rebel generals. While Brenan did not fully abandon the two fundamental assumptions underlying the existing images of Spain—that Spanish history and culture were fundamentally different from those of the rest of Europe, and that there was something like a Spanish

Volksgeist, a national character, “genius,” or “soul”—he did introduce an unprecedented level of nuance and sociohistorical perspective. And he did so in two ways. First, national character was, for Brenan, but one of a whole set of factors determining Spain’s social and political development. Second, he showed how the Spaniards’ singular cultural makeup—including their presumed penchant for fanaticism and violence—was the result of a long evolution determined by a particular set of historical, social, and geographical circumstances. “The famous orientalism of the Spaniards is not due to ‘Arab blood,’” he writes, for instance, with reference to an idea that had been commonplace since the romantic period, “but to climate and geography” (105). Similarly, he pointed out that the anarchists’ much-maligned brutality had, at least in part, a perfectly practical explanation: “the fact that the Spanish syndicalist organizations do not give strike pay means that their strikes are conducted in an atmosphere of hunger that easily leads to violence” (70).

In addition to advancing these practical explanations for tendencies that were generally held to be determined by the Spanish character, Brenan never tired of emphasizing that the violence of the workers’ and peasants’ movement occurred in a context of severe repression and exploitation. “The conditions under which they lived,” he writes of the rural population, “were such that no one could deny that they had good reasons for their actions” (230). The urban working classes, too, “were suffering very real hardships” (253). The hatred of the church among the rural and urban poor, and their readiness to burn religious buildings or kill priests and nuns, was more than understandable. If the Spanish *pueblo*, “the most naturally religious people in Europe,” turned against the clergy, it was only because the church—once a great force of social justice—had become “a purely self-seeking institution with no real care for [the people’s] interests” (45), and unashamedly allied with the rich.

Brenan, in effect, constructs a genealogy of Spanish culture and society, representing it as the result of a set of factors that are contingent, rather than determined by a collective soul or destiny. This analytical framework also implies that the Spanish situation can be transformed. On several occasions, in fact, Brenan formulates specific proposals for change. In his chapter on the agrarian question, he traces the spread of anarcho-syndicalist ideas in Andalusia to the situation of the peasantry, which became the object of ruthless exploitation after the disentailed church lands were bought up by private

owners. The severely underpaid, landless laborers, Brenan writes, “are all Anarchists,” and logically so: “The herding together of labourers for months at a time away from their families also increases their receptivity to revolutionary ideas” (122). But if the popularity of anarchism is linked to particular conditions like these, the situation can be changed by modifying those conditions: better irrigation, for instance, and making land available for communal ownership and use (185, 186). Nor did Brenan believe that the war itself was a fate-ordained product of the violent Spanish soul. He did believe that the Spaniards, as a whole, shared particular traits, including a certain penchant for fanaticism; but he did not subscribe to the common notion that they were naturally more cruel or bloodthirsty than other peoples, and that they were, therefore, condemned to killing each other by the thousands every couple of decades. For him, “the most important single cause of the Civil War” had been “the refusal of the Spanish upper classes to yield an inch” in the agrarian question.

Brenan’s view of the war as an event determined by particular circumstances—circumstances that, in principle, could be modified—also left the door open to the possibility of progressive change—to a Spain, that is, which was more socially just and, therefore, less violent. Brenan was quick to point out that the Republican parties went about their reform program in clumsy ways, and he spared them no criticism for their naïveté. But the whole idea of a modern, democratic, peaceful Spain did not appear, in the *Labyrinth*, as an impossibility.

This does not mean that Brenan minimizes Spanish cultural idiosyncrasy. It is quite clear to him that a modern Spain will not be like England or France. The Spaniards are simply too different. “Liberalism failed in Spain,” Brenan writes, “because Spaniards are essentially anti-capitalist and uncompetitive: they have neither the bad nor the good qualities, neither the attachment to money for its own sake nor the suppleness and perseverance required for success in the modern capitalist world.” For Spaniards, there is little distinction between commercial gain and stealing: their “medieval conscience” tells them “that all sudden or unjustified gain . . . is a crime.” Rather than to liberal capitalism, then, Spain’s economic system and cultural attitude lend themselves “with particular aptness to a socialist experiment” (125).

In spite of his view that Spain was best suited for a moderate form of socialism, Brenan had a strong interest in Spanish anarchism. His two long chapters on the topic also provide important clues about the ethical basis of Brenan’s Hispanophile sentiments. While his views on

party politics were generally diffuse and pragmatic, his outlook on life and the world was rooted in a personal ethics that valued asceticism, frugality, spirituality, and “vitality” over money and material or physical comfort. Brenan loved and admired Spanish peasant culture largely because he believed that it had retained these values to a much greater extent than industrialized Europe (particularly, of course, his own England).²⁹ Brenan further believed that the anarchists’ ideas embodied, like nothing else, those elements that distinguished the Spanish attitude to life—elements that he considered crucial not only to Spain’s future, but also to the country’s ability to help Europe regain what it had lost in its pursuit of material progress. To be sure, Brenan was quick to point out the violent, fanatical dimension of Spanish anarchism; and he warned his readers that, from a political point of view, it was naïve, impractical, and likely to lead to the worst of tyrannies.³⁰ But he found much to admire in the anarchists’ ethics all the same. Discussing the similarities between anarchism and Carlism, he notes that “as criticisms of society both canalize a feeling that is very deep-seated among Spaniards”: “a hatred of political shams, a craving for a richer and deeper social life, an acceptance of a low material standard of living and a belief that the ideal of human dignity and brotherhood can never be obtained by political means alone, but must be sought in a moral reformation (compulsory, it is needless to say) of society” (xxiii).

HISPANOPHILIA, COMMITMENT, DISCIPLINE

What initially drove Brenan to write his study was his shock and baflement at the violence of the war. How could these people whom he loved and admired, and among whom he wanted to spend the rest of his life, turn on each other like this? Brenan’s one fundamental purpose in the *Labyrinth* is to explain, to himself as much as to his audience, how things could have come this far.³¹ At bottom, however, the *Labyrinth* also aims to explain the war’s background to the Spaniards themselves. Born from concern and consternation over Spain’s ordeal, the book is a Hispanophile’s declaration of love. It was definitely read as such by the Spaniards when it was finally translated in 1962.

In another sense, however, Brenan’s didactic urge to explain the country went against his Hispanophile instincts. His love for Spain was rooted in an awareness of difference: while Brenan felt a deep

affinity with what he saw as the main tenets of the Spaniards' attitude to life, he never ceased seeing himself as an Englishman. It is no coincidence that for this middle class male intellectual, the Spanish people were most perfectly embodied by the workers, peasants, and women with whom he surrounded himself. Spain was always other. Explaining Spain to the English, though, implied hermeneutically bridging the gap between self and other—that is, translating Spain into English terms. Brenan realized that understanding, let alone solidarity, are hard to conjure up for a people seen as exotically distant. Thus, writing the *Labyrinth* fundamentally changed Brenan's relationship to Spain.

To appreciate the extent of this change, it is useful to consider Brenan's life until 1943. When he embarked for Spain in 1919, he knew little more of the country than that it had been "neutral in the war and would therefore, I imagined, be cheap to live in."³² When he settled in Yegen, a small peasant town in the Andalusian Alpujarra mountains, Brenan was twenty-five years old. He had been born in 1894 in Malta, where his father was then posted. Hugh Brenan, a subaltern in the Royal Irish rifles, was a third generation military man, forced to retire early after malaria had left him almost completely deaf. When Gerald was six, the whole family moved back to England. Gerald's mother Helen, the daughter of an Irish merchant, encouraged her son to read, and instilled in him a lifelong love of nature. She and Gerald both suffered under Hugh's bad temper. Gerald's time at school was miserable, as was life at home with his irritable father. From early on, much of Gerald's life was marked by the struggle to escape his own milieu and the future it held for him. Hugh wanted him to follow in the family's footsteps, but Brenan avoided the military academy by sneaking out of the country with a friend, buying a donkey, and embarking on a walk to India. (After some 2,500 kilometers, the Bosnian winter forced him to turn around.) After the outbreak of the World War in 1914, he was drafted after all, serving mostly in France. Once demobilized, he was more determined than ever to go his own way.

Spain was, to a large extent, the embodiment of Brenan's escape from his cultural and class environment. What he appreciated in the country and its people was, first and foremost, how different they were from everything he associated with his family's type of Englishness—not just in terms of culture and values, but also of class and gender. He loved premodern, peasant Spain, in whose worldview and

lifestyle he saw embodied a vitality and authenticity that he found lacking at home. In his Andalusian village, he had stumbled on “a society which puts the deeper needs of human nature before the technical organization that is required to provide a higher standard of living.”³³

Until the outbreak of the Civil War, Brenan’s relationship to Spanish high culture was almost solely of a bookish nature. He became fascinated early on with Spanish religious literature, particularly mysticism, and began working on a biography of Saint Teresa in 1924. (A study of St. John of the Cross came out much later.) But Brenan did not have much contact with middle class Spaniards, and even less with Spanish writers and intellectuals. In this sense, his isolation was almost complete. His involvement and connections with the English cultural world were all the stronger. Brenan made long and frequent trips back to England, spending only about half of the sixteen years between 1920 and 1936 physically in Spain.³⁴ His strongest, and almost sole, connection to Spanish life was his servants and their children. His relationship to the Spanish *pueblo* was not only paternalistic, but sexual as well. In 1931, Brenan had a daughter by his maid Juliana, and he later boasted of having slept with all his maids at least once.³⁵

It is one thing to live in a country, enjoy its lifestyle, and get on with your local servants; it is quite another to become a scholarly expert of its culture and history. Writing the *Labyrinth* not only changed Brenan’s relationship to Spain, however, but also to his fellow Englishmen—for whom he now became an authoritative mediator between Spain and Britain—and, ultimately, to himself. His self-imposed scholarly discipline forced him to take distance from his own political and cultural sympathies and preconceptions. In the preface to the book’s second edition, written in 1952, Brenan notes how hard this was (xiii).

To what extent Brenan succeeded in this effort is a matter of discussion. As Gathorne-Hardy points out, Brenan’s treatment of Spanish history was, in general terms, “scrupulously fair.”³⁶ Raymond Carr has called it “surprisingly impartial.”³⁷ It is also hard to doubt his rigor—the depth, scope, and precision of his research. At the same time, there is never any doubt where the author’s preferences lie politically, as much as culturally. He never ceases to write as a Hispanophile with a strong debt to romanticism,³⁸ and his severe criticism of Republican policies and decisions is clearly rooted in a basic sympathy

with their aims. In the end, though, the tension among Hispanophilia, commitment, and discipline is a productive one. Much like in Southworth’s work, it is his political and affective drivers that provide Brenan with the energy and dedication necessary for what is ultimately a remarkably disciplined scholarly work. And I would argue that it is the particular combination of Hispanophilia, political commitment, and scholarliness—a combination as conflictive as synergetic—that accounts for the extraordinary strength of the book.

In the years that followed, this propitious combination fell apart. Several things happened. Brenan became tired of, and disillusioned with, politics, particularly Spanish politics. His work on the *Labyrinth* had left him exhausted and without energy for further scholarly endeavors of such scope and intensity. Finally, he realized that he did not want to spend the rest of his life in England. He needed Spain. And given the international situation, this meant that he had, somehow, to find an accommodation with the Franco regime. Hispanophilia, in other words, trumped both political commitment and scholarly discipline. As a result, Brenan’s subsequent writings on Spain, though of great interest and originality, never achieved the level of the *Labyrinth*. Instead of continuing to nuance notions of an eternal Spanish national character, his later books tend to strengthen, even celebrate, them. In 1943, Brenan still allowed for the possibility of change and modernization in Spain, albeit on its own cultural terms. His later works not only give less reason for hope in this respect, but seem opposed to it. In the late 1940s, Brenan even began to doubt the desirability or convenience of reintroducing democracy in Spain. In 1954, he wrote that only the implementation of long overdue agrarian reforms would allow us “to see whether political democracy is, as it claims to be, the best type of government for all countries.”³⁹

For Brenan, the preservation of the Spain he loved—a repository of values that he believed absent or lost in most of the industrialized world—proved, in the end, more important than the introduction of particular political structures. “Spain is my country, revolution or no revolution,” he had written to Ralph Partridge in early 1936 after telling him that he was going to meet the revolutionary socialist Largo Caballero, “and if it goes red I must try and change my colour too.”⁴⁰ In the same way, postwar Spain was still his country, even if it meant living under Franco.

LETTING GO OF THE REPUBLIC

The years of the Second World War, however, were still marked by an intense political involvement with the Republican cause. Overnight, the *Labyrinth* had turned Brenan—an autodidact without university degree—into a well-known and respected authority on things Spanish, and a prominent voice in the British public sphere. He socialized with Spanish politicians in exile, wrote letters to the editor, and lobbied with the British government.⁴¹ He also worked for the BBC's propaganda service *Voz de Londres*, writing some twenty-three radio columns in Spanish that were meant to subtly encourage sympathy for Britain among the Spanish public without alarming the regime.⁴² Meanwhile, he continued working on a long Spanish Civil War novel, *Segismundo*, which, like so many of his projects, remained unfinished.

In hindsight, Brenan's period of passionate commitment to the cause of the Republic stands out as an exception. After the end of World War II, he reverted back to the cavalier pragmatism that had characterized his political views before the outbreak of the war in Spain.⁴³ Brenan's changed position vis-à-vis the winners and losers of the Spanish war began to manifest itself soon after the end of World War II. In February 1945, he had written a letter to the *Times* in which he still defended the Spanish Republican exiles as a distinguished and moderate group, while denouncing the Franco regime as dangerous and despicable.⁴⁴ In November, he wrote an article in the *Spectator* in which he still emerged as a convinced antifascist strongly committed to democracy. Reviewing the available options for the future, Brenan stated that the moderate Republicans would be "most apt for steering Spain through to better days," but he doubted they would be allowed back by the Right. More likely to succeed, therefore, would be a return of the monarchy, perhaps even in a constitutional framework. In any case, the Spanish people should be allowed to decide for themselves on their preferred form of state. "Let those people who tell us so blandly that representative institutions do not suit Spain explain in what way they find dictatorships suit it better," he concluded; "Perhaps, if we press them, we shall discover that they are the same people who once glorified the Nazis."⁴⁵

Soon, though, Cold War logic started setting in, and Brenan found it more difficult to apply solid democratic principles to the political situation in Spain. In a letter to the *New Statesman* in June 1946, Brenan criticized the British government for its covert support of Franco,

whose ruthless repression of moderate liberals and socialists had the undesirable effect of pushing the anti-Francoists toward Russia and Communism. Instead, Britain and the United States should "agree on concerted measures against the Franco regime," allowing the Spanish army to oust the extremist dictator and inaugurate a more moderate political climate.⁴⁶ As time passed, Brenan became increasingly less certain whether and how the world should go about regime change in Spain. In the July 1946 issue of *Current Affairs*, he wrote a long piece that, after a clear and simple introduction to Spanish history largely modeled on the *Labyrinth*, could only formulate questions with regards to the present and future status of the Franco regime: "It is obvious that Franco . . . is an undesirable neighbor. But would it be right to take action to get rid of him? And, if so, what sort of action would be needed? And who would take his place if he went?"⁴⁷

A LITERARY HISPANIST

Brenan's doubts were accompanied by increasing ennui and irritation. He was getting sick and tired of Spanish politics. By the time the *Current Affairs* article came out, he had decided to embark upon a new ambitious Hispanist project that allowed him to ignore politics while indulging in his love for things Spanish, and build on his new reputation as an authoritative British voice on Spanish culture. In July 1946, he set to work on a comprehensive history of Spanish literature from the Roman times to the 1920s. Again, the project was a therapy of sorts, providing a much-needed distraction from the drabness of post-war England, the depressing situation of Franco's Spain and the sordid machinations of international politics. It quickly absorbed Brenan completely—he managed to finish it in a mere three years.

The Literature of the Spanish People, published in 1951, further established Brenan's reputation as a brilliant Hispanist. Like the *Labyrinth*, it combined sophistication with accessibility. Beautifully written and interspersed with idiosyncratic reflections, it was thoroughly researched but wore its scholarship lightly. The book was well received, albeit with more reserve by academic Hispanists than by the mainstream media. Predictably, Allison Peers did not like it. But a nit-pickingly negative review by the Liverpool Chair of Spanish in the *Times Educational Supplement*⁴⁸ fueled an indignant retort from his colleague at Cambridge, J. B. Trend. The reviewer, Trend wrote,

“seems more concerned with condemning the book than with reading it,” and Brenan’s work—solid, sensitive, and up to date with the latest scholarship—was “far beyond those vapourings which have so often passed for Spanish studies.”⁴⁹

Concentrating on literature allowed Brenan to indulge in his fascination with Spanish national character. After all, “it is through its art and literature that the essential spirit of a country or age is most readily grasped.”⁵⁰ Spanish literature, Brenan argued, has “a character unlike that of other European countries,” thanks to both history and geography: the Muslim presence, the Reconquest and Reformation, frequent civil conflict, the great variety in landscape and climate. Being “the literature of a people who have scarcely ever known security or comfort,” it is taut and alert, remarkably realist, but also suffused with melancholy and nostalgia (xi-xii). Brenan’s selection criterion was endearingly circular, leaving aside all those texts that could not be considered “truly Spanish” (ix).

In May 1952, on a visit to Spain, Brenan wrote to Ralph Partridge that his book had been getting “very encomiastic reviews in Spanish literary journals. One came out with the headlines *Un amigo de España*.”⁵¹ This positive reception was less surprising than it seems. Brenan had skillfully avoided all explicit reference to politics, and limited the scope of his book to exclude the generation of writers most directly involved in the Civil War—only allowing himself to remark that the Falangists’ murder of García Lorca “cut short one of the most astonishing poetic careers the world has seen” (444). He had also ended his study with a postscript in which he had reflected on—and ended up celebrating—Spain’s stubborn cultural isolation: “perhaps its greatest glory lies in its powers of resistance to foreign influence and to modern civilization, in its determination to preserve pure and unmixed its own highly original soul” (464–65). These thoughts did not only imply an indirect condemnation of the modernizing project of the Republicans, who had wanted to make Spain more European, but also dovetailed nicely with the view of Spanish culture and identity—anti-European, rigorously self-sustaining, and suffused with traditional purity—that the Franco regime had been endorsing.

COMING TO TERMS WITH FRANCO’S SPAIN

By the beginning of 1949, when Brenan had all but finished his *Literature*, he decided it was time to return to Spain to check things out

for himself. He was getting tired and depressed of life in postwar England, and after thirteen years of absence, his nostalgia for his house in Andalusia was becoming unbearable. He and Gamel left in February, by airplane this time. Brenan had already decided to write a book about his trip, for which several publishers had expressed interest.⁵² The couple was in Spain from February 10 to April 19, 1949; *Face of Spain*, written in the form of a travel journal, came out in 1950. The ten weeks Brenan and his wife spent in Spain were, in many ways, an exile's return, marked by a typical combination of recognition and estrangement. They limited their itinerary largely to the south, going from Madrid to Andalusia and Extremadura, and back to the capital through Talavera, Toledo, and Aranjuez. The trip changed the Brenans' life: they decided they would definitely "come and live in Spain"—despite Franco.⁵³

The circumstances of the trip and the book are curiously obscure. Brenan barely mentions them in his autobiography, and it is not quite clear how he, as a known sympathizer of the Republic whose books were banned from the Peninsula, managed so quickly to obtain permission for his visit from the Spanish authorities. José Ruiz Más suggests that Brenan, always in need of money, might have been tempted to accept the sponsorship of "some entity or individual(s) interested in publicizing a very particular image of the country"—specifically, the Monarchist lobby.⁵⁴ This might also explain, Ruiz Más argues, the rapid publication of the book's Spanish translation, which appeared in Buenos Aires only a year after the English edition. Ruiz Más's suspicion is sparked especially by the way Brenan shapes what seems a simple travel journal to bolster two very specific political positions: that Spain should receive international financial aid and that its only hope lay in a restoration of the monarchy.

Whether or not Brenan's book was sponsored by the Spanish monarchist lobby, it is quite clear that he wrote it with a particular agenda in mind. Because he had decided to move back, he had to avoid irritating the regime,⁵⁵ which, in turn, meant distancing himself from his earlier anti-Francoist positions.⁵⁶ To Brenan's credit, he managed to do this rather slyly, without seriously affecting the rhetoric of honesty that had characterized the *Labyrinth*. Still, in his otherwise positive review of the book for *The New Republic*, the American Hispanophile Waldo Frank noted with some indignation that Brenan had adopted the regime's ideologically charged designations for the two camps in the Civil War: "Again and again he speaks of the Civil War as between the Rights and the Reds."⁵⁷ Brenan's account paid subtle lip

service to the regime's propaganda points in other respects, too. Franco's portrayal of the Republicans as fanatically opposed to the spiritual dimensions of Spain's artistic heritage, for instance, is echoed by Brenan's shock at finding churches stripped of their religious art: "Too much has been written of the care shown for works of art by the Republicans. The spoliation of half the churches in Spain, of which we were here seeing a small sample, represents an enormous artistic impoverishment for the country. . . . This is the more grave because the things that we make today are ugly and spiritless."⁵⁸ And while, in the *Labyrinth*, Brenan had presented the workers' anticlerical violence as an entirely understandable reaction to the church's long-term complicity in their repression, now he sees their destructiveness as reason enough to undermine their cause altogether: "[W]hen one side wantonly destroys the great works put up by other men in the past, they should remember that they are attacking the spirit of humanity and by this proclaiming their own unfitness to win" (199).

In addition to distancing himself from his earlier defense of the Republican cause, Brenan also skillfully depolitized his own image more generally. After professing his own loss of interest in the matter ("I was tired of politics—especially of the hopeless politics of the Peninsula"), he explained he simply had not been able to stop the Spaniards' steady stream of political comments: "[F]rom the moment of our arrival in Spain to the moment of our leaving it we were besieged by people who wished to talk to us about the political situation. Never have I been in a country whose citizens were so anxious to express their views on their government" (xi-xii). Still, throughout the book, he is careful to make sure that the most explicit political statements are expressed by his interlocutors rather than by the author. The *generalísimo* himself, moreover, is almost completely sheltered from criticism.

Brenan's position vis-à-vis the regime is ambiguous. At several moments, he suggests that the government is only partly to blame for the country's appalling misery—the real causes are "Spain's political isolation, . . . two years of drought and . . . the Civil War." And the only real solution is Marshall Aid. On the other hand, Brenan states that a "change of regime . . . is much to be desired" (xvii). But because this change can only be gradual, he is in favor of the international normalization of Franco's Spain (which at that point was still excluded from the United Nations), including financial aid, diplomatic

relations, and international tourism. He strongly invites his British and American readers to consider a Spanish vacation (xvii-xviii).⁵⁹

In his preface, Brenan mentions two dangerous "illusions" that he hopes to dispel: first, that "Franco can be got rid of by reducing the country to its last legs" and, second, that "the alternative to Franco is parliamentary democracy" (xv). With reference to the first point, he points out that Franco is a consummate survivor—apart from the fact that starving the working classes only helps the growth of Communism. Genuinely democratic elections, on the other hand, would no doubt unleash the revenge of the vanquished—a prospect of which the victors are too fearful to allow anything of the sort. For Brenan, therefore, the first step to any long-term, reconciliatory solution of the crisis is a restoration of the monarchy. These positions help make *Face of Spain* quite a bit more conservative than the *Labyrinth*.⁶⁰

But the most remarkable difference with the *Labyrinth* is the book's obsession with Spanish national character as an unchanging, and unchangeable, reality.⁶¹ To be sure, Brenan paints anything but a rose-colored picture of postwar Spain. He notes the unspeakable and widespread poverty among large segments of the population. He talks openly about the rampant corruption among government officials, especially members of the Falange, although, as said, he is careful not to imply Franco himself in the denunciation. And yet, he somehow manages to infuse his book with a general sigh of relief. After three years of war and ten of dictatorship, Brenan was exhilarated to conclude that little had fundamentally changed. This Spain was still *his* Spain (27), as was obvious in the smallest detail, such as the Spanish waiters' pride in their jobs, so different from the Englishman's "mixture of sloppiness and Puritan philistinism" (5). Yes, the regime might be authoritarian, but that did not change the fact that the vital, impulsive Spaniards, who had "not yet been conquered by the pattern of industrial life with its crushing discipline" were fundamentally less repressed than his fellow Englishmen in democratic Britain. In Spain, Brenan saw a "kind of freedom and spontaneity that I missed at home" (254).

Politically, this conclusion is ambiguous. In the same way that Brenan does not make any explicit link between the policies and nature of the country's regime and the sorry economic state that he finds it in, he also leaves open the possibility that Spain's essential nature might have been preserved not in spite of Franco but *thanks to* him. This idea is not as outrageous as it sounds. Franco, after all, was all for preserving

Spain's traditional cultural identity, defending it tooth and nail against the corrupting influence of European modernity. Franco's postwar economic policy of autarky, moreover, celebrated the economic sacrifice to which it condemned a large part of the population—hard work for little pay with an appalling scarcity of the most basic foodstuffs—as a manifestation of Spain's unique vocation for asceticism and its appreciation of spirituality over materialism. This was exactly what Brenan had always liked about the Spaniards. Brenan is also notably ambivalent about the destitution that he witnesses. On the one hand, he feels the need to decry it, and he does; on the other, he cannot help attributing the Spaniards' continued vitality to those same dire circumstances. Poverty is “stimulating”: “It charges the air with real desires and cravings” (91).

Brenan's self-confessed investment in the preservation of the Spain he knew and loved—poor, ascetic, premodern—undermined his previous sympathy for Republican reformism. For one thing was certain: had the Republican project prevailed, then by 1949, Spain would have been just another modern, secular, educated nation—much less similar to the country Brenan had known in the 1920s than postwar Spain under Franco. And while, as we have seen, the Brenan of the *Labyrinth* relativized and historicized notions of Spanish national character, deliberately refusing to construe its cultural idiosyncrasies as impediments to modernization, *Face of Spain* presents a much more fatalistic analysis of the country's “soul.” If in the *Labyrinth* Brenan had downplayed the supposedly innate violence and fanaticism of the Spaniards—their “ungovernability” and unfitness for modern democracy—in *Face*, he takes the opposite route. “The Spaniards' innate love of destruction,” he writes about the first weeks of violence following the military rebellion, “their obsession with death, their tendency to fanaticism found full vent in these orgiastic scenes because there was no civil or religious authority, no moral force or inhibition, that could restrain them” (146). Elsewhere he remarks on “the strange blood lust that, as the Civil War and the Carlist War and the Napoleonic War all show, comes over them on particular occasions—that morose, half sexual, half religious passion in which they associate themselves with Death and do his work for him” (295). In his preface for the British edition (which was shortened in the American version), Brenan strongly argues against the notion that Spain is ready for parliamentary democracy. Given Spain's “shell-shocked” state, and the general thirst for revenge, democracy would only

unleash another civil war. But when one links his politically incorrect conclusion—that “Spain for some time to come needs to live under an authoritarian regime” (xvi)—with the notion of the “innate love of destruction” and “tendency to fanaticism,” one cannot help but wonder whether Brenan thinks Spain will ever be fit for democracy at all.

As Buchanan has shown, Brenan was not the only British Hispanophile who, forced to “make some form of mental accommodation with Spain as it now existed in the Franco era,” retreated from a combative pro-Republican stance into a more apolitical position. Nor was he the only one to be grateful that Spain, despite or thanks to Franco, had retained its basic cultural identity.⁶² In fact, *Face of Spain* was one of a whole spate of British books on the country written by intellectuals who had long had an affective relationship with the country. Brenan’s friend V. S Pritchett published *The Spanish Temper* (1954), John Langdon-Davies wrote *Gatherings from Catalonia* (1953), Rose Macaulay, *Fabled Shore* (1949), and Sacheverell Sitwell, *Spain* (1950). As Buchanan notes, these books had important things in common: they not only “emphasised the unchanging, timeless nature of Spanish life,” but also expressly tried to detach the country, people, and culture from the regime.⁶³ Like Brenan, Pritchett was relieved to find Spain not “fundamentally changed” and still radically different from northern Europe.⁶⁴ Buchanan argues that Brenan, Pritchett, and others, in effect, helped encourage “the process of cultural ‘normalization’ between Britain and Spain that accompanied [the] strengthening of diplomatic and economic relations.” In this process, “Spain passed from being widely perceived as a pariah state, governed by a bloodstained dictatorship, to a country which many Britons, of all social groups and political backgrounds, felt comfortable about visiting.”⁶⁵

Within Brenan’s own trajectory as a British Hispanist, *The Face of Spain* confirmed two important changes with respect to the *Labyrinth*, written only six years earlier. The first is a turning away from politics that, in practice, amounts to shift to the right. From a critical pro-Loyalist position, Brenan has moved toward a skeptical, pragmatic acceptance of the Franco regime as one of Spain’s only realistic options. The second is a relapse into a romantic, essentialist celebration of Spain’s innate national character as wonderfully different from the drab industrial world of postwar England⁶⁶—but also as an impediment to Spain’s democratization. In a sense, the national character angle was built into the premise of Brenan’s book, and implicit

in the questions with which he decided to undertake his journey: “What was Spain really like? What was the character of Spanish culture and civilisation? How did it compare with the French and the English?” “[I] wished,” he writes, “to give my attention to the more permanent and characteristic features of the country. Regimes, I said to myself, come and go, but what is really important in Spain never changes” (xi-xii). The angle was also an appropriate one for the modest, entertaining travel book that *Face of Spain* aimed to be. Together with his politics, Brenan had toned down his ambitions, too.

The single most important note of continuity with the *Labyrinth*, on the other hand, is Brenan’s Hispanophilia. Returning to Spain really felt like coming home. As he wrote to Partridge: “This is the country for life and it is also unbelievably beautiful.”⁶⁷ Once again, this book is a declaration of love for Spain as a uniquely vital and beautiful place—and an exasperated complaint about the depressing dullness of England. And yet, in the book’s last pages, which reflect on the difficulty of readjusting to life back home, Brenan has to admit that Britain, “for all its mossiness of mind and its grey philistinism and its dread of reality” is also the country of liberty, civilization, and social responsibility—and therefore, in the end, “worth belonging to” (310).

MOVING BACK TO ANDALUSIA

Back in England, Brenan set about writing *The Face of Spain* while eagerly preparing for his permanent return south.⁶⁸ Meanwhile, *The Literature of the Spanish People* came out and Cambridge published the second edition of the *Labyrinth*, with a new preface in which Brenan, among other things, subtly softened his criticism of the Catholic church. Linking its dogmatic inflexibility with certain constant traits of Spain’s national character, he skillfully managed to turn what, in the book itself, had appeared as a form of social and political immorality, into a basic cultural virtue:

It is true that a Church as rigid and uncompromising as the Spanish Church is not conceivable in France or Italy. But is not that the case with almost every other Spanish body and institution? . . . [S]een from this side of the Pyrenees, the chief virtue of Spain may be thought to lie in its intractability. Death by monotony, by sameness, by loss of identity

is—if we are spared destruction in another war—the fate held out by the brave new world of universal control and amalgamation. Against that death Spain will put up a long drawn out resistance. (xiv)

And while he did not shy away from condemning the Nationalist rebellion, which he called foolish and wicked (xiv), Brenan’s subsequent publications, including two pieces for the *New York Times Book Review*, continued to manifest a growing tolerance of the Franco regime.⁶⁹

On February 5, 1953, Woolsey and Brenan moved back into the house at Churriana that they had bought in 1935. By now, Brenan had all but lost interest in Spanish politics and felt he lacked the energy for any sustained scholarly work.⁷⁰ Still, his occasional book reviews confirm the tendencies I signaled in *Face of Spain*: an increasingly pragmatic view of the Franco regime, skepticism about the possibility of democracy, and a relapse into a fatalistic and essentialist view of Spanish character.⁷¹ The extent to which Brenan had abandoned his pro-Republican stance of 1936–45 is clear from his critical review, in 1954, of Claude Bowers’ *My Mission to Spain*—a memoir in which the former U.S. ambassador to Spain gave an account of his experience during the war, defended his past actions, and continued to proclaim his support for the Loyalist cause. Brenan noted with disapproval that Bowers’ view of the war, as well as his political stance, had hardly evolved from the simplistic representation that was current among Loyalist supporters—including Brenan himself—while the fighting was still ongoing. Bowers’ book struck him as an anachronism.⁷² Against Bowers’ lament for the Republican defeat, Brenan argued that Spain would likely have been worse off if Franco had lost the war. And whereas Bowers, as a good liberal, called for the prompt reestablishment of democracy in Spain, Brenan strongly doubted whether democracy was, in fact, a fitting form of political organization for Spain at all—at least so long as the unresolved agrarian problem maintained the population’s standard of living at one of the lowest levels in Europe. Meanwhile, Brenan was confident that the Franco regime, influenced by its European surroundings, would become “progressively milder and more liberal in spirit,” allowing Spain to return to its “national tradition, which, except where heresy was concerned, has always been egalitarian and tolerant.”⁷³

When he retook possession of the Churriana house, Brenan was about to turn fifty-nine. Although he would continue to write for more than thirty years, the move to Spain signaled a turning point. From now on, his books would be increasingly backward- and inward-looking. His three major titles published after 1953—*South From Granada* (1957), *A Life of One's Own* (1962), and *Personal Record* (1974)—are all autobiographical. Socially and politically, he would slowly withdraw as well.⁷⁴ Meanwhile, the Spain he knew and loved quickly began to disappear from under him.⁷⁵ What Brenan liked about Spain was its utter lack of comfort, and he liked to think of the Spaniards as a people spiritual and vital enough happily to endure physical hardship.⁷⁶ In an article from 1958, he complained that, while the dictatorship had deadened the country's intellectual life, its increasing prosperity was slowly destroying its charm. Worse, "one cannot go far without running into other tourists."⁷⁷

If, in postwar Britain, Brenan was overcome by a longing for Spain, he now became burdened by nostalgia for the Spain of his past. Soon after returning to Churriana, he began the first of his memoirs, describing his years at Yegen. When it was published in 1957, *South from Granada* quickly became Brenan's most popular book. Ironically, it was also the book that did most to help draw tourists to Andalusia. In effect, it offered up Spain for consumption by the foreign masses, enhancing its reputation as a prime travel destination for North Europeans and Americans. *South from Granada* also confirmed Brenan's transformation from political historian of Spain to Hispanophile memorialist, chronicler of the picturesque, and entertainer of "armchair travelers."⁷⁸

South from Granada is, once again, a declaration of love for a Spain that is nothing like the rest of Europe. "I feel quite unequal to putting into a few words the peculiar feeling of acquiescence and delight which, almost from the first, this village and its way of life . . . produced on me. . . . This is a land that nourishes at the same time the sense for poetry and the sense for reality and neither of these accords with the utilitarian outlook" (xii-xiii). The Spaniards, in spite of their relative poverty, were happier than most inhabitants of wealthier industrial societies. This was in part because of their "primitive community feeling," which assured everyone, large and small, of "a niche in society which was his by right" (xiii). "One of the things that we have lost today—perhaps we never had it in England—" he notes

similarly, “is the sense that all the most important acts in life . . . have their ritual” (101).

The nostalgia that suffuses *South from Granada* has a political dimension as well. In the end, it underscores Brenan’s profound ambivalence with regards to progress and modernization in Spain, or anywhere else for that matter—projects to which, in the *Labyrinth*, he had still seemed to subscribe. In the end, Brenan was a romantic through and through: he could not help associating poverty and physical hardship with “vitality” (50), and modernization, wealth, comfort—or even formal education—with what he called “soullessness” and a general loss of authenticity.⁷⁹ And again, one of the book’s central preoccupations is the Spaniards’ collective cultural identity. “Andalusians are a people with a natural feeling for art and beauty,” he writes (90); “In this country the thought of death eats into life, and as soon as the intoxication of first youth is over, begins to sap the taste for pleasure” (112). Brenan the Hispanophile is, at heart, a conservative, almost a reactionary. Party politics have retreated almost completely to the background. The book’s postscript, which recounts what happened in Yegen after Brenan left it, is impartial about the events of the war: atrocities were committed on both sides, but the people are ready to forgive, forget, and move on (278).

FROM HISPANOPHILE TO HISPANIST—AND BACK AGAIN

Hispanophilia was the single most important constant in Brenan’s career as a writer on Spain. In the same way that the Spanish Civil War helped turn Allison Peers from academic specialist into a public intellectual, it turned Brenan from Hispanophile into a scholarly Hispanist. It was his love of Spain, his indignation at what was happening in the country, and his commitment to the Republican cause that provided him with the extraordinary energy needed to write *The Spanish Labyrinth*, a model of scholarly discipline. From a Hispanist point of view, it was Brenan’s best work by far. In his life and work after the *Labyrinth*, however, Hispanophilia increasingly dominated both discipline and commitment.

Brenan’s Hispanophilia also provides the key to his many contradictions. His affective relationship with Spain is based on a very particular image of country, based on rural Andalusia, as representing a worldview and set of values fundamentally different from those

dominant in England and the rest of industrialized Europe. Brenan's attraction to Spanish society is derived from a double sense of difference and affinity. If one remembers that Brenan was a male, middle class, English intellectual who was not rich but never had to work for a living, his fascination with rural, peasant, illiterate Spanish society (particularly women), as well as his belief in the virtues of poverty, clearly emerge as the typical, romantic fascination with his own perceived opposite. On the other hand, though, his love of Spain was based on a sense of recognition as well: Brenan really did feel more at home in Spain, more in tune with its lifestyle and values. In the end, the appreciation between Brenan and his Spanish acquaintances was quite mutual. More important, the fact that his Hispanophilia led him to genuine insights about Spain meant that it must have been much more than the product of romantic projection and nostalgia.

As in the case of Southworth, his amateur status—and his resolute rejection of university offers⁸⁰—provided him with a freedom that was conceptual as much as stylistic. It is no coincidence that one of the most pathbreaking works of British historiography on Spain was written outside of the university. Still, important contradictions remain. From a British perspective, Brenan was a liberal; as a Hispanophile, he became increasingly conservative, even reactionary. He claimed to lament the cannibalization of “his” Spain by the tourist industry, but he probably contributed more than any other writer to turning the country into an object for foreign consumption. It is perhaps only fitting that, by now, Brenan himself has become something of a commercial product.

EPILOGUE: AN AWKWARD HISPANIST HERO

One of the curious side effects of the Franco dictatorship has been the prominence and popularity bestowed on the foreign intellectuals who wrote about Spanish history and culture during and following his rule. *Hispanistas* such as Southworth, Paul Preston, Pierre Vilar, Hugh Thomas, Gabriel Jackson, and Stanley Payne have enjoyed a success among the Spanish public that no foreign expert on French or British history will ever enjoy in France or Britain. This is, in part, because the Spanish have long been unusually preoccupied with foreign views of themselves, but also because, during and even after the dictatorship, the foreign historians' scholarly freedom and aura of

objectivity granted them a credibility not easily available to any Spanish historian. Still, none of the *hispanistas* achieved the level of legend that Brenan did after the death of Franco.

Brenan's tremendous popularity, to which he never aspired and which bothered him more than it flattered him, is a curious phenomenon, based on a contradictory mix of attributes. On the one hand, he is admired in general terms as an "*amigo de España*" (including Franco's Spain) and an unequalled analyst of the Spanish soul. "He understood us better than we understood ourselves," the Andalusian councilor for cultural matters declared in 1984.⁸¹ On the other hand, he is revered as an anti-Francoist intellectual, a tireless defender of the Republican cause, and a symbol of moral and sexual freedom. Although these images are not necessarily compatible with each other or congruent with the facts, they helped solidify Brenan's iconic status in post-Franco Spain.

One could say that it all began when José Martínez's Ruedo Ibérico (the publishing house in exile that brought out Southworth's books) published a Spanish translation of the *Labyrinth* in 1962, the same year that the translation of Hugh Thomas's *Spanish Civil War* came out. Both books became instant must-haves for the anti-Francoist opposition. As Carr recalls, copies of *El laberinto español* were promptly smuggled into Spain, where they became "a sacred text for the democratic opposition to Franco."⁸² The fact that the author had been living in Franco's Spain for almost ten years, and had largely distanced himself from politics, did not seem to matter.

Brenan's popularity received a further boost when the censorship on some of his work was finally lifted in early 1974. The Spanish version of *South from Granada* came out in May and was an instant success. "Journalists from Madrid, students and admirers came to [Brenan's house in] Alhaurín," his biographer writes, "sometimes as many as seven a day." A television film was made as well.⁸³ Franco died in November of the next year, and Spain entered a convulsive period marked by political and cultural liberalization. It was in the middle of this process that Alianza published the Spanish translation of Brenan's third autobiographical volume, *Personal Record*. Brenan's openness in matters of love and sex when discussing his and his friends' complicated sentimental relationships found fertile ground in a Spanish society that had just thrown off the stifling yoke of narrow Catholic morality. Brenan achieved instant cult status among the younger generations, for whom he "came to symbolize the revolution in manners

that was sweeping Spain.”⁸⁴ The fact that excerpts from *Personal Record* dealing with the Civil War were published in the opposition newspaper *El País* further contributed to Brenan’s association with the new, progressive, post-Franco Spain. In fact, of course, Brenan could be seen as much as a symbol of sexual repression as of liberation. More important, he had long ceased being an anti-Francoist. As a reporter for the *New York Times* noted: “There is a mild irony in the ban [of Brenan’s books until mid-seventies], since, while Mr Brenan’s sympathies lay with the republic during the civil war, he has gradually come to have a certain amount of respect for the late dictator. ‘Old Franco gave us wages and houses—that’s what they say,’ he said.” Although noting that the dictator also “killed a lot of people after the war,” Mr. Brenan said he believed that “in future ages he’ll be regarded as one of the great men of Spain.”⁸⁵

CHAPTER 9

BRITISH HISPANISTS AND THE CURSE OF CONSERVATISM

Around the late 1980s, the tranquil waters of British Hispanism were rippled by a wave of discontent as a group of youngish, theoretically-minded scholars cast a series of damning indictments of their own discipline. The field, they claimed, was methodologically outdated, institutionally petrified, and ideologically suspect. “British Hispanism still presents a narrow, highly selective and linguistically defective introduction to the foreign culture(s) it studies, relying almost exclusively on a literary access route,” Barry Jordan stated in *British Hispanism and the Challenge of Literary Theory* (1990). To Jordan, the field seemed “permanently in intellectual arrears.” It appeared “disturbingly parochial in its intellectual interests,” reflected “a pervasive cultural mandarinism,” and had been “largely unwilling . . . to reflect on its own assumptions and practices.”¹ Jordan (b. 1950) lamented that British Hispanism had been almost completely oblivious to the theoretical “revolution” that had rejuvenated literary studies throughout the 1980s, particularly in English. But although this revolution had by now become comfortably institutionalized elsewhere, Jordan argued that, for Hispanism, “the questions raised by theory are still important enough to warrant attention, elucidation, and dissemination.” His sense of urgency was further fueled by his awareness of the potential threat to academic literary studies posed by Margaret Thatcher’s utilitarian-minded educational policies.

In the cutthroat environment of the Thatcher years, Jordan found British Hispanism woefully unprepared to battle for its existence as a

humanistic discipline. British Hispanists' lack of theoretical self-awareness, particularly, was not only lamentable, but embarrassing. They had never even bothered to properly define their object of study. “[I]n Britain and elsewhere,” he wrote, “there seems to be a strong temptation to evoke the ‘Hispanic World’ as if it were actually *there* in a pure, unproblematic way.” In fact, of course, the notion was heavy with ideology: “Indeed, were it not for the fact that Spain and Portugal were at one time imperial powers, there would be no such thing as Hispanism at all.”²

Why had British Hispanism proven so immune to the academic aftermath of 1968? For Jordan, the discipline’s imperturbability was in part due to its “accumulated investments in a rather anachronistic high-culture literature, nurtured by a criticism which stands at the margins of present-day social, political, historical and cultural developments.” Another factor explaining the field’s resistance to theory was “a type of defensiveness,” seemingly “associated with a long-standing sense of cultural inferiority.”³ Finally, Hispanism’s institutional marginality and conservative makeup were, for Jordan, directly related to the cultural, political, and economic marginality of Spain itself, at least in the European context, and to the way this marginality had been interpreted and constructed in countries like Britain.

This same marginality of the discipline had been highlighted a couple of years earlier by Paul Julian Smith (b. 1956), who was then just emerging as one of the most innovative Hispanists in the United Kingdom—shocking the field out of its slumber by, among other things, exposing the Spanish Golden Age to the world of poststructuralist thought. Yes, Spanish literature had long been marginalized within the northern academy and its cultural world, Smith argued in the conclusion to *Writing in the Margin* (1988), but this was, ironically, in large part *thanks to* the efforts of northern Hispanists, particularly those of the humanist school. Ideologically bent as they had been on ignoring or repressing the “diversity and discontinuity” of Spanish culture, particularly of the Golden Age, these Hispanists had “failed to recognize [its] unique quality.” Smith also argued, however, that the marginality of Spanish literature—its long period of forced exclusion from the “dominant intellectual tradition”—could be turned into a powerful advantage now that the basic tenets of that tradition were “increasingly called into question”: “Golden Age writing,” Smith argued, “defines by its very marginality the arbitrary parameters of the European culture which cannot absorb it and

dare not admit it.”⁴ Smith’s claim for the particular value of Spanish Golden Age literature and culture as a critique of dominant Western thought, then, was, in effect, premised on a rejection of the bulk of previous Hispanist scholarship.

In the 1990s, Jordan and Smith were joined by a third angry young Hispanist, Malcolm K. Read. In several books and articles, Read (b. 1946) confronted his British colleagues—including Smith—with a series of searing genealogical critiques of the discipline.⁵ Read, moreover, wrote from a self-identified position as a British Marxist from a working-class background who had never ceased feeling out of place among his mostly middle class Hispanist colleagues. Read’s version of institutional history pushed the hermeneutics of suspicion to the limit: Hispanism, for him, was not only outdated or ideologically suspect, but marked from its institutional birth by its hopeless complicity with structures of social and imperialistic oppression. In “Traveling South: Ideology and Hispanism,” Read undertook a critical reading of the first volumes of the *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* from the mid-1920s, calling attention to the “extraordinary importance attached to traveling” in those founding years of the discipline. Allison Peers’ belletristic reports on his visits to the south, in particular, show that the northerner’s trip to Spain is a journey into literature, religion, and “the Self.” Spain, Read argued, was construed from the beginning as a means by which the northerner could find spiritual fulfillment, embodied in a set of “eternal values” unavailable to him at home. In terms of class, the northern subject saw himself as a “a natural member of an elite, a ruler,” placed above the people inhabiting his romanized South.⁶

Read further argued that the professionalization of British Hispanism after World War II signified a break with the romantic amateurism of Peers’ generation, without affecting the field’s conservative orientation. The rise of Alexander A. Parker and his epigones implied a “shift from aesthetics to morality.” Under the influence of Richards and Leavis, Parker approached Spanish literature—focusing on the Golden Age, in contrast with Peers’ preference for mysticism and romanticism—in search of universal moral lessons, as well as a formal “harmony” and “unity” that, in the end, were made to serve as models for *social* harmony and unity.⁷ Parker’s school liked to see itself as more scholarly rigorous than its predecessors, but, in practice, Parker was no less obsessed than Peers with religious morality and social order.⁸

Read's critical analysis of Hispanism is useful, but only in a limited way. For him, the disciplinary institution is so hopelessly caught up in the repressive apparatus of imperialist capitalism that he is unable to conceive of an alternative *modus operandi*. As Jon Beasley-Murray writes, in Read's world, Hispanism is "damned if it does and damned if it doesn't."⁹ This is not to say that Read is necessarily wrong in his general diagnosis of the situation. It is true that British Hispanism as an academic discipline "was constituted after the First World War, against the backdrop of an imperialistic, competitive capitalism, organized along increasingly monopolistic lines." Read is also largely correct in stating that Hispanism's "programmatic aim was to reassert the values of pre-capitalist culture that, while largely surpassed in the heartland of Europe by the end of the eighteenth century, still survived in Spain," and that, in ideological terms, the discipline "exhibited a profound ambivalence towards commerce and trade, whose materialism it despised but whose existence underpinned its own cultural enterprises."¹⁰ The problem is that Read's inevitable conclusion—that "the traditional Hispanist, by cultivating the subjective sensibilities of a minority (who ran the Empire), served the middle class in its capitalist exploitation of Third World Countries"—preempts any nuanced analysis of the discipline's precise evolution, particularly in light of its marginalized institutional position and the countercultural, oppositional stance adopted by many of its representatives.¹¹ Here, I will suggest some ways to go about such an analysis.

TROUBLE IN THE MARGIN

In the past twenty years, British Hispanism has undergone a major transformation.¹² The impact of the cultural studies model, particularly, has resulted in a spate of groundbreaking scholarship and a new rapprochement between literary critics and historians, perhaps best exemplified in the introduction to Spanish cultural studies coedited in 1995 by Helen Graham and Jo Labanyi. What Jordan, Smith, and Read were really reacting against in the late 1980s was the legacy in British Hispanism of A. A. Parker's brand of liberal-humanist literary studies, which had become hegemonic in the two or three decades following World War II, and whose influence had continued well into their time. The four main assumptions of the Parker school were, in Jordan's words: (1) "that there is a thing called Literature (capital

L”); (2) that “the job of criticism is to help us *respond* to literature more fully and that therefore criticism exists as a largely neutral, random body of scholarship and interpretation, which is undoubtedly plural in its views of different individual texts but innocent of any other ulterior motive”; (3) that “literature is valuable because it can tell us something about the period which produced it but, perhaps more importantly, it can provide insights and truths about man, human nature, human relationships and life itself, truths which are timeless and universally valid”; and, finally (4) that texts are “artifacts whose authenticity and value are seen to derive from their assumed unity and coherence, features which are to be demonstrated by means of ‘close reading.’”¹³ In practice, of course, these were the principles that had guided the bulk of literary studies in the Western academy until the late 1960s. Jordan was right, then, to argue that the intradisciplinary critique formulated by Smith, Read, and himself was, in one sense, the belated Hispanist version of the theoretical battles that had already been fought elsewhere in the humanities. What made this battle different, however, was the fact that it was fought in a discipline that had always seen itself as outside of the mainstream—and that, more importantly, had never been able to decide whether that marginality was something to be lamented or celebrated.

Jordan, Read, and Smith explain their field’s flaws by way of institutional history, calling attention to the fact that some of the discipline’s most influential figures were politically and culturally conservative, even reactionary, and largely driven by a notion of Spain as a repository of traditional values.¹⁴ As was to be expected, their critical analyses caused some turmoil. Read’s “Traveling South,” for instance, sparked a spirited polemic in the pages of the short-lived *Journal of Hispanic Research*. In a sternly corrective response, the senior Hispanist Nicholas Round took issue with some of Read’s central tenets. Stephen Hart made an attempt at friendly mediation; Read wrote an aggressive retort. A number of other Hispanists weighed in. Although there is no room here to go over all these interchanges in detail, Round’s response is worth a closer look, in part because it helps nuance some of the more fatalistic dimensions of Read’s analysis.

Round’s first rhetorical move is to chide Read for scholarly irresponsibility: “his blending of *a priori* and anecdotal matter yields, overall, a recklessly inadequate account,” he writes. “Sharp rebuttal must be in order, if useful argument is to proceed.”¹⁵ Round gives Read credit for pointing out some of the peculiar features of early

British Hispanism, including “the curious flowering” of the travelogue, but points out that the figure of the northern traveler was by no means limited to the conservative sector. In Round’s view, the Hispanists’ basic flaw is their failure to transcend the myth of romantic Spain that informed many non-scholarly accounts of the country; and he wonders why “first-rate scholars should have aspired to write like second-ranking men of letters.” For Round, indulgences like the travelogues were part and parcel of British academic culture, suffused as it was with “a class-based ideal of amateurism and effortless cultural knowing.”¹⁶ Where Read sees conservative complicity with capitalism, Round prefers to see a “rich array of contradictions,” most clearly embodied in the figure of Allison Peers—a scholar with amateurish traits, politically conservative, yet progressively pro-Catalan, and so on.

Round’s principal problem with Read’s analysis is that, in its thirst for ideological denunciation, it fails to acknowledge the *scholarly* contributions of previous generations of Hispanists. Thus, Read ignores the value of William Entwistle’s “classically-trained scholarship”; the extent to which the generation following Peers, particularly E. M. Wilson, cured the field from its amateurish and belletristic tendencies, infusing it with a new notion of rigor; or how, upon Peers’ death, the *Bulletin* quickly transformed itself into a regular learned journal.¹⁷ But Round’s most important corrective concerns Read’s vision of A. A. Parker. True, “it did matter very much to Parker that each significant text should demonstrate a unity, and that this should disclose a corresponding unity in society and in the cosmos.” But Round strongly disagrees with Read’s dismissal of Parker’s work as informed by an “idealistic empiricism.” For Round, the key to understanding Parker lies in “his being a Catholic, a Thomist, and a Platonist.” As a Catholic, he felt it his duty to teach his mostly Anglican countrymen—steeped in centuries’ worth of anti-Spanish and anti-Papist propaganda—about the importance of Peninsular culture, particularly of the Counter-Reformation. In the British context, this was far from a mainstream position to adopt. Parker’s Thomism was expressed in his commitment to intellectual rigor. It was the Platonism that fueled the metaphysical search for unity.

For Round, any criticism of Parker and his school should begin by distinguishing “practical commitment to reasoned, text-based argument” from “the metaphysics underlying his conclusions.” In this context, it is “perfectly possible to find the former exemplary and the

latter optional.” For all its flaws, in fact, postwar British Hispanism fulfilled an important political function insofar as it allowed for the production of knowledge in a scholarly environment infinitely less constrained than that of Franco’s Spain: “The questioning, on detailed empirical grounds, of various mythic commonplaces of Spanish cultural history could also bear an aspect of political dissent.”¹⁸ The downside of British empiricism, and of its innate suspicion of generalizing models and theories, was that the bulk of its work remained “piecemeal, localized, monographic”—which, in turn, only confirmed its marginal institutional status within the humanities. This marginality was even geographical: for Round, it is no coincidence that British Hispanism has always been strongest at regional universities in the Irish, Scots, or Welsh periphery.

Round usefully complicates the binaries that inform Read’s vision: progressive / conservative, hegemonic / marginal, political / apolitical, amateurism / professionalism, disciplinary unity / diversity. At the same time, most of Round’s own arguments seem only half developed. Thus, he fails to connect the early Hispanists’ “class-based ideal of amateurism” with their Hispanophile tendencies—that is, with their image of Spain as an ideal space for the spiritualized leisure of the upper class. Similarly, Round’s neat separation between Parker’s commitment to academic rigor and the metaphysics informing his conclusions is too facile. It trivializes the extent to which Parker’s scholarship, however rigorous and methodical, was always driven by his *a priori* moral and affective investment in a very particular notion of Spanish culture.

And while Round charges Read with selective citation, he himself proceeds not very differently. His list of works cited contains only four texts by Parker, the earliest being an essay from 1953 in which Parker distances himself from some key tendencies in Spanish conservative thought and which, for Round, illustrates the extent to which British empiricist rigor could be mobilized to undermine Francoist ideology. What Round fails to mention is the tension between this essay and much of Parker’s earlier production, which manifests a rather high level of identification with the tenets of Spanish traditionalism. Finally, Round ignores how much Parker and other British Hispanists, for all their commitment to scholarly rigor, did to help legitimate the Franco regime. They did so not only by engaging with its institutional apparatus, but also by confirming, through their scholarship, some of the regime’s basic ideological tenets—particularly its definition of Spanish

culture, identity, and history as firmly grounded in religious tradition, and the triumphalist reading of its achievement of religious and national unity, as well as its colonial enterprise.

* * *

I will return to these points in a moment. First, however, we need to take a few steps back. The main purpose of this chapter is to provide a basic institutional background to the lives and careers of Gerald Brenan and Allison Peers presented in the two preceding chapters, focusing primarily on scholars of their own generation—particularly J. B. Trend (1887–1958) and William Entwistle (1895–1952)—as well as the next, which includes figures like William C. Atkinson (1902–99), Helen F. Grant (1903–92), A. A. Parker (1908–89), E. M. Wilson (1906–77), P. E. Russell (1913–2006), and Raymond Carr (b. 1919). As elsewhere in this book, the main focus will be on Hispanists' reactions to the outbreak of the Civil War and their subsequent interaction with the Franco regime. And, as elsewhere, I am particularly interested in the tension among Hispanophilia, commitment of an ethical, political, or religious nature, and the disciplinary imperative of scholarly rigor.

I will formulate three main arguments. First, I suggest that Jordan and Read were largely right to see British literary Hispanism as genealogically burdened by powerful streaks of conservatism and nostalgia—tendencies that the Civil War and its aftermath did little to modify. True, there were important exceptions: some British Hispanists, even prominent ones, had a decidedly liberal disposition. But, in the end, the very structure of the discipline—particularly its axiomatic notion of Spain as fundamentally different from Britain, as well as its progressive academic specialization, which made it harder for academics to adopt explicit political positions¹⁹—tended to privilege the conservative line. Second, I will argue that the Franco regime came to constitute a serious embarrassment for British Hispanism—an impediment as well as a source of shame—that further contributed to the field's institutional marginalization. Third, we will see that the outbreak of the Civil War and the concomitant surge in British interest for Spanish politics and history eventually sparked the birth of a flourishing branch of British *historical* Hispanism whose evolution would be markedly different from its older literary sibling. British historians of Spain not only proved ideologically more diverse than their literary colleagues, but they held an image of Spain—and of their own

role as Hispanists—that was fundamentally distinct from that cherished by Allison Peers, Alexander Parker, and their heirs. And yet, the historians, too, had to navigate the polarized waters of twentieth-century Spanish politics and find some kind of *modus vivendi* with the institutions and representatives of the Franco regime.

BRITISH HISPANISM: A BRIEF HISTORY

The British have long been drawn to Spain, but accounts of British travelers in the Peninsula became particularly popular in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.²⁰ As we saw in Chapter 2, the Spanish war of independence against the French (the Peninsular War) fueled an unprecedented interest and admiration for the Spanish people among British politicians, intellectuals, and the wider public, drawing a sizeable group of soldiers, officers, and sympathizers to the country. The examples of Richard Ford and George Borrow as prominent nineteenth-century Hispanophiles and amateur Hispanists have also been mentioned already. Still, Hispanism has always been a marginal humanistic field in the British university—in relation to the Classics as well as to French, German, or English studies—and its history cannot be fully understood without taking this marginality into account. Much of the first Hispanists' work and attitude was directly related to the need to shore up their field's public presence and prestige.

British Hispanism has never been the kind of massive academic enterprise that it became in the United States. Until the foundation of the Association of Hispanists of Great Britain and Ireland (AHGBI) in 1955, there was no British equivalent of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish, nor did the field ever develop the kind of corporate spirit that the AATS represented. Still, the evolution of the discipline can be sketched along the same two axes we mentioned in Chapter 4: Peninsularism versus Latin Americanism, and literary versus historical Hispanism. (As before, I'm leaving linguistics out of the picture.)

For logical, largely geographical reasons, the rise of Latin Americanism occurred somewhat later in Britain than in the United States—its real takeoff occurred after the Parry Report was issued in 1965²¹—and did not pose as severe a threat to the hegemony of Peninsular studies. However, its initial rise can certainly be seen, at least in part, as a result of the Spanish Civil War and its aftermath,

which made travel to Spain problematic and more generally made the Iberian Peninsula less attractive as an object of academic study. This was true for the older as much as for younger generations. J. B. Trend's interest in Latin America originated largely in his refusal to go to Franco's Spain, and in the fact that many of his Spanish friends and acquaintances had gone into Latin American exile. Peers, partly in response to Spain's negative reputation in the postwar years, gave an increasingly central role to Latin America in his incessant public relations campaign on behalf of Spanish learning; in 1949, he renamed his *Bulletin* from *Spanish* to *Hispanic Studies*. The younger generations of Spanish students were also increasingly drawn to the other side of the ocean. A recent poll among Britain's first literary Latin Americanists shows that, in the 1950s and '60s, Franco's Spain was something of a turnoff. Latin America, by contrast, offered much more exciting prospects, especially for those who had progressive political leanings. Gordon Brotherton, who, on his first trips to the Iberian Peninsula, had felt Franco's Spain to be uncomfortably oppressive, experienced Latin America in the 1960s as "a huge breath of fresh air."²² For Peter Turton, Jean Franco, and William Rowe, Latin America also offered the opportunity of combining literary studies with a form of sociopolitical engagement.²³

For historians, the situation was different, as we will see. When, in the 1960s, Spain became established as a serious subject of historical research in British universities, it somehow managed to attract precisely the kind of student of a liberal or progressive disposition who, in literary studies, tended to gravitate toward Latin America. Once they had climbed up the academic ladder, these scholars in turn attracted younger generations to the field. The 1960s and '70s were crucial decades for the development of Spanish historiography in Britain, as they were in the United States. But, unlike the American situation, the subsequent decades did not witness a decline.²⁴ As a result, historical and literary Hispanism in Britain are on a much more equal footing today, in terms of prestige and public presence, than they are in the United States.

THE ORIGINS OF BRITISH HISPANISM

Until the 1960s, however, the study of Spain in British universities was almost completely confined to literary Hispanism, a field that had never quite managed to transcend its romantic, religious, and parochial

origins. Ironically, the nineteenth-century forefather of this predominantly conservative discipline was a liberal Spaniard. When the University of London was founded in 1828, Antonio Alcalá Galiano, who had arrived as an exile five years earlier, was the first to hold an appointment as an academic Spanish teacher. His resignation two years later inaugurated a seventy-nine-year gap, which lasted until the appointment, in 1909, of James Fitzmaurice-Kelly to the newly founded Gilmour Chair of Spanish at the University of Liverpool—the first in the country.

Fitzmaurice-Kelly (1857–1923), Peers' immediate predecessor, was Britain's first real academic Hispanist. A Roman Catholic born in Glasgow, Fitzmaurice-Kelly had learned Spanish as a child, and after a trip to Spain in 1885, started publishing widely on the country in the British press. In 1892, he published a biography of Cervantes, and six years later he issued the first edition of his *History of Spanish Literature* (revised in 1913 and 1926), which confirmed his reputation at home and abroad as Britain's foremost authority on Spain. Fitzmaurice-Kelly did much to raise the public presence and prestige of Spanish culture in Britain, much like his friend Archer Huntington in the United States. It was he who wrote the more than three dozen articles on Spanish literature and culture in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*; it was he who was responsible for the first English edition of Cervantes' complete works and for the first *Oxford Book of Spanish Verse*. In 1916, he left Liverpool for King's College to take possession of the newly created Cervantes Chair. The same year—the Cervantes Tercentenary—marked the creation of six Spanish lecture-ships at British universities.

Peers later insinuated that Fitzmaurice-Kelly's scholarly credentials left much to be desired.²⁵ It is true that while Fitzmaurice-Kelly put Spain on Britain's cultural map, it was Peers' generation that laid the institutional groundwork for the flourishing of Hispanism as a full-blown academic discipline. In the 1930s, Britain's three most prominent Hispanists were Peers, chair at Liverpool since 1920; J. B. Trend, at Cambridge since 1933; and William Enwistle, at Glasgow since 1925 and at Oxford since 1932. They could not have been more different from each other in terms of academic interest, approach, and even personality. None of the three had been formally trained as a Hispanist—the first professor in Britain to have read Spanish as an undergraduate was William C. Atkinson, who, in 1932, succeeded Entwistle in the Stevenson Chair of Spanish at Glasgow, which he occupied until his retirement in 1972.

Peers, Trend, and Entwistle, pioneers and partial autodidacts, did not focus solely on the production of scholarly knowledge of Spanish literature and culture. Peers, as we have seen, felt strongly compelled to interpret contemporary events for a wider English-speaking audience, pointing to the value of Spain's religious traditions for England and the world. Trend, too, wrote books for the wider public—a musicologist by vocation, he had begun his career as Spanish correspondent for the *Athenaeum*—but he was allied with Spain's liberal reformers. Entwistle had the least public presence. Trained as a classicist and philologist, he transcended the disciplinary boundaries of Hispanism through his interest in Arthurian legends as a transnational phenomenon. Politically, Entwistle was a conservative who despised contemporary culture and thought of the professoriate as a “a sacred priesthood” far removed from politics.²⁶

BRITISH HISPANISTS AND THE WAR

The differences among Britain's leading Hispanists became more outspoken in the 1930s, and particularly after July 1936, when the British public sphere became sharply polarized over Spain. In general terms, the pro-Loyalists in Britain were far more successful in making their case than those who sympathized with the Rebels. The British population overwhelmingly supported the Republicans, as did the intellectuals.²⁷ Unlike their American colleagues, however, British Hispanists did not abstain from public opinion making. Peers was not the only one to write in the press—so did Parker, Trend, Entwistle, and Atkinson. Remarkably, the most vocal among the British Hispanists tended to sympathize not with the Republic, but with Franco.

The main exception was Trend, whose Spanish friends belonged to the liberal-Republican sector associated with the *Institución Libre de Enseñanza*. Trend had fallen in love with Spain in 1919–20, when he spent a year there as magazine correspondent, becoming closely acquainted with Manuel de Falla and García Lorca. Like Brenan, Trend had left for Spain after several traumatic war years in the British army, and, like Brenan, he experienced southern Spain, particularly Granada, as a paradise on earth.²⁸ Compared to the rest of Europe, what struck him in Spain and the Spaniards he met was their “spirit of idealism, humanity and common sense,”²⁹ which he saw embodied in the Republic, and which he defended in books like *The Origins of*

Modern Spain (1934).³⁰ During the war, Trend was widely known to sympathize with the Loyalist side,³¹ and although his partisanship was never quite as public as Peers', he made no effort to hide it.³² In September 1936, he agreed to join a Committee of Enquiry into Alleged Breaches of International Law Relating to the Intervention in Spain, which sought to prove that Hitler and Mussolini were flouting the Non-Intervention Pact by aiding the Nationalists, thus putting the Republic at an unfair disadvantage.³³ That same fall, he wrote a letter to the *Times Literary Supplement* denouncing the murder of his friend García Lorca.³⁴ Trend visited Loyalist Spain in the summer of 1937;³⁵ the same year, he joined the British effort to shelter Basque refugee children.³⁶ In 1938, he followed the first Spanish Republican exiles to Mexico, a country whose hospitality for European refugees he praised as exemplary. “[I]t was clear,” he wrote later in a book on this trip, “that, in most countries, the cultured and civilized people were uncompromisingly on the side of the Republic.”³⁷

Peers, as we have seen, became a public defender of the traditional, religious Spain that the Nationalists claimed to defend. Entwistle, meanwhile, kept out of the public sphere almost entirely, with the exception of a short piece in *The Listener*, the weekly magazine of the BBC, explaining the background of the war. Carefully avoiding any impression of partisanship, Entwistle writes that the outbreak of the conflict was “a consequence of the failure not only of the Republic but of the Monarchy and Parliamentary Rule and Dictatorship as well,” while describing the Nationalist revolt as “unconstitutional, but still common enough in Spanish tradition.”³⁸ The tension between patriotism and Hispanophilia that we have noted in other Hispanists was notably absent in Entwistle, who felt little affection for Spain and whose loyalty to Britain and its empire was full, automatic, and uncomplicated.³⁹ The piece in *The Listener* ends with a plea for an eminently pragmatic approach to the Spanish war, keeping the importance of Anglo-Spanish relations front and center. Britain, he writes, cannot afford to be “indifferent to the Spanish tragedy,” not only “for humanity’s sake” but “because our imperial interests are involved in it.” In the end, for Entwistle, empire trumps democratic principle: “The form of a government does not necessarily affect its foreign policy, and we have in the past been friends with many different kinds of Spanish governments in Spain. . . . [H]owever the war ends, I believe their traditional goodwill will be maintained in the future.”⁴⁰

Peers, Trend, and Entwistle operated on such different academic and ideological wavelengths that British Hispanism long lacked any sense of the field as a collective enterprise. The war only served to emphasize their personal and political divisions.⁴¹ Not surprisingly, they adopted widely diverging attitudes toward the Franco regime. Trend, in solidarity with the hundreds of intellectuals who chose exile over life under dictatorship, refused to set foot in Spain after the war, although he did not prevent his students from going.⁴² Peers traveled back in August 1939 and as soon as he could after the end of World War II. Although he would become progressively disenchanted with the *caudillo*, he saw no reason not to establish educational, scholarly, and cultural connections with the regime's institutions. Entwistle had no problems with academic travel to Franco's Spain, either.⁴³ On one hand, he believed that scholarship had no business with politics; on the other, he believed that good Anglo-Spanish relations should naturally include scholarly interchange. Nor was he unsympathetic to Franco. In an article summarizing the activities of British Hispanists during the Second World War, he praises Walter Starkie's biography of Cardinal Cisneros, published on the heels of Franco's victory, as "opportune in the moment of its appearance, when Spain was returning for inspiration to the epoch of the Catholic Monarchs," while chiding Trend's *Civilization of Spain* for its liberal "prejudice."⁴⁴

THE YOUNGER GENERATIONS

The proclamation of the Second Republic and the outbreak of the Civil War hit Peers, Trend, and Entwistle in mid-career. But how did the political turmoil in 1930s Spain affect the slightly younger generation—those Hispanists who were in their twenties, just entering the profession, and who, a decade or so later, would emerge as the field's new leaders? Peter Russell, later Peers' successor at the helm of the *Bulletin*, was twenty-three when the war broke out. Alexander Parker was twenty-eight; E. M. Wilson, thirty. Although political events in Spain occurred in a formative stage of their careers and might well have had a more significant impact on them than on their older colleagues, their actions and reactions in the 1930s have, as yet, barely been studied.

Peter Russell's stint in Spain with the British Secret Service has recently attracted some attention, thanks, in large part, to the prominent

role granted him by his friend, the novelist Javier Mariás.⁴⁵ As is his wont, though, Mariás is more mystifying than revealing as to the true nature of Russell's activities.⁴⁶ Two other relatively well-known cases are those of Helen F. Grant (1903–92) and Rica Brown (1909–84). Grant had been traveling to Spain on a regular basis from the early 1930s. Like Trend, Grant became closely acquainted with the country's left-liberal intellectual circles; later, she declared that her trips to Spain had helped turn her into a "passionate socialist."⁴⁷ When the Civil War broke out, she was an assistant lecturer at Birmingham University. In March and April 1937, she undertook a trip to Loyalist Spain to investigate the situation of Republican refugees and to see if anything could be done to improve their situation.⁴⁸ After a stint at the Foreign Research and Press Service during World War II,⁴⁹ she was appointed University Lecturer at Cambridge, under J. B. Trend, where, as her former student Nigel Dennis recalls, she was known to be strongly opposed to the Franco regime.⁵⁰ Rica Brown, who later married the Hispanist Reginald Brown, also did relief work for Spanish refugees in the spring of 1937, although, as Helen Grant writes, she was "never a very politically committed person."⁵¹

William Atkinson, who in 1932, at barely thirty, had been named to the Stevenson Chair at Glasgow, also emerged as an active publicist on Spanish affairs during and after the Civil War. In 1934, he had published *Spain, A Brief History*, in which he had characterized the Republican Constitution as "greatly influenced by Russia," and stated that the Republic's advent had "seen a serious weakening of the sense of legal and moral responsibility throughout the country," although he also commended its leaders for having "severed the roots of ecclesiastical domination" and "keeping the Army in its place."⁵² In the years of the war, Atkinson published around ten articles on Spain and Portugal in the Catholic *Dublin Review*, the *Nineteenth Century and After*, and the *Fortnightly*. In these pieces, he adopts a distant tone and carefully avoids taking sides, emphasizing the need for reconciliation and mutual understanding among Spaniards of different political creeds. Underscoring the fundamental differences between Spain and England, he consistently judges the situation and future prospects of Spain in terms of its national character, which, for him, is marked more by its defects than its virtues.⁵³ Still, it is not hard to detect Atkinson's preference for a Nationalist victory, at least initially.⁵⁴

During the Second World War, Atkinson served as the head of the Spanish and Portuguese sections and Foreign Research and Press Service

at the Royal Institute of International Affairs. It seems that he also worked in the Foreign Office where, among other things, he reported to the British Intelligence Service on the activities of Spanish Republican exiles in Britain, including Negrín and Martínez Barrio.⁵⁵ After the war, Atkinson continued to write on matters Spanish in the *Fortnightly* and *Nineteenth Century*. As time passed, his view of Spain became more negative; he also gradually distanced himself from the Franco regime.⁵⁶ In 1959, Atkinson, together with E. M. Wilson, Frank Pierce, and Ignacio González Llubera, cosigned a letter from Salvador de Madariaga protesting the arrest of academics in Spain.⁵⁷

ALEXANDER PARKER AS MILITANT CATHOLIC PUBLICIST

Even more interesting than Atkinson's case is the role played in the 1930s by his colleague Alexander Augustine Parker who, though six years his junior, would later emerge as the undisputed leader of post-war British Hispanism. Parker was born in 1908 in Montevideo, Uruguay; his father was an English diplomat, his mother Uruguayan. After going to school with the Dominicans in England, he went up to Cambridge to read Modern and Medieval Languages. Starting in 1930, around the time he was finishing up his BA, the precocious Parker began to write regular contributions in the Catholic press about Spanish history and current events. In nine years' time, he produced close to twenty articles. It is safe to say that, with Peers, Parker was one of the most prolific British Hispanists writing for a general audience on 1930s Spain. The end of the Civil War also marked an end to Parker's frequent contributions to the press, although he did not cease his publicist activity entirely.

While Parker's scholarly contributions have long attracted wide attention, his early work as a Catholic publicist has hardly been studied at all. In fact, though, Parker's role as a commentator on contemporary Spain from the 1930s through the 1960s sheds a revealing light on the origins and makeup of postwar British Hispanism, providing an important backdrop to the arguments presented by Read and Round. Because there is no space here for an exhaustive analysis, we will only take a brief look at some key texts to sketch Parker's evolution in this respect. As we will see, Parker, too, struggled to resolve the tension between his Hispanophilia, his ethical, political,

and confessional position, and the imperatives of the scholarly pursuit of truth.

Parker's first known publication on Spain, which appeared in September 1930 in the Oxford-based Catholic journal *Blackfriars*, was an unapologetic defense of the Spanish Counter-Reformation. Parker, barely twenty-two years old, opened his article lamenting that "the simplest facts about Spain should not form part of the average Englishman's education." This was bad enough. In a Catholic, however, "such ignorance is unpardonable."⁵⁸ In order to remedy his readers' presumed lack of knowledge, Parker proceeds to give them a lesson in Spanish history. Praising the Catholic Kings' achievement of national and religious unity through the expulsion and conversion of Moors and Jews and, later, the "conversion of the savage inhabitants" of America, Parker writes: "The great imperial and religious ambitions and ideals of Spain explain the great spiritual vigour of the nation, the stupendous output of energy and the vast influence upon the whole world."⁵⁹

Nine months later, a second article followed in which Parker addressed the contemporary political situation in Spain. Just four weeks earlier, in April, the country had been proclaimed a Republic. Again, Parker's tone is surprisingly self-assured. He cannot, he writes, "take Spanish politics seriously."⁶⁰ Although "Spain is a country one can love with gratitude and joy," it has been saddled with "a lamentable history of deplorable government."⁶¹ The choice between Monarchy and Republic, Parker believes, is not ultimately important—Spain needs to find a "system of democratic government" that "suits the Spanish people and is not a servile imitation of foreign methods."⁶² In this context, Parker is extremely skeptical about the Europeanizing reform program propagated by liberal intellectuals like Azaña. Although their ideals are "admirable enough," they are "misguided," presuming "a state of liberty and democracy which surely does not exist."⁶³ More important, Parker strongly disagrees with the Republicans' vision of Spain as a backward, uncivilized country in *need* of modernization. At this point the young Hispanist breaks into a heartfelt Hispanophile panegyric:

Is Spain uncivilized because it manufactures no motor cars, because the express trains do not average fifty-five miles an hour nor run for two hundred miles without stopping? Is it uncivilized because factories do not pour out useless articles of luxury; because instead of wasting their

time making such articles the vast majority of the inhabitants sow and gather their crops, tend their vines, pick their fruit, and do not care twopence for a vote? . . . No, Spain is a far more civilized country than most of the so-called great powers, for in it the family still reigns supreme, a child is a blessing and not a curse, the domestic virtues flourish, and religion lives in the hearts of the people; because agriculture is the means of livelihood, large towns are rare, life is hard and austere, with luxury almost unknown, and yet happiness and a simple care-free spirit are the hall-marks of the nation. . . . Progress means continuation in a standard of sane living. Spain has not moved with the times, and thank God for that!

Spain's "enlightened intellectuals," he predicts, "will never turn Spain into a second England. They will never uproot the standard of sane living from the hearts of the peasantry, and it must be remembered that the greater part of the population are peasants."⁶⁴

The young Parker's love of Spain, then, is rooted in an image of the country as fundamentally different from England; as a nation whose past greatness resides in its religious zeal and unity; and as a culture whose importance is intimately connected to its being—and *remaining*—overwhelmingly rural and premodern. Given this premise, it is not difficult to predict Parker's reactions to subsequent developments in Spain. In the seventeen additional articles that he would publish in the Catholic press in the seven turbulent years following the proclamation of the Republic, he manifests a strong attraction to the Catholic Right, especially to the Carlists. In early 1933, he was happy to witness "a glorious awakening of Catholicism in Spain."⁶⁵ In 1934, he holds up Spain as a source of hope in a world that has lost its moral compass, and as a sure bastion in the struggle against Marxism.⁶⁶ In three articles on Carlism published during the war, he praises the Carlists' "courage and religious fervour" and "their wholehearted devotion to their cause."⁶⁷ In early 1938, he writes a defense of the Spanish Church, although he stops short of fully endorsing the Catholic hierarchy's backing of the Nationalists.⁶⁸

From these pieces, it is clear that Parker interprets Spanish events of the 1930s almost exclusively from the perspective of a Roman Catholic Hispanophile. Like Peers, he conceives of himself as an expert in Spanish affairs, whose mission it is to inform his British readership of the vicissitudes of their brothers in faith in one of the most Catholic countries in Europe. And there is little doubt that his sympathies, like those of Peers, lie with the Nationalists. Still, as in Peers' case, it would

be a mistake to brand the young Parker a full-blown Francoist. True, he rejected the left-Republicans' modernizing program, and was horrified by all revolutionary movements on the Left. But his endorsement of the Nationalists was not unconditional, based as it was on his identification with traditionalism rather than with fascism and militarism.

The year 1939, which saw the end of the war in Spain, also marked a watershed in Parker's life and career. He left Cambridge, accepting a position as lecturer and department head at the University of Aberdeen. At the same time, he almost completely stopped writing for the general media on current events in Spain, focusing on his scholarly production instead. His first major book, *The Allegorical Drama of Calderón*, appeared in 1943. It is not entirely clear why Parker scaled back his activity as a Catholic publicist. He may have felt that the Nationalists' victory had freed him from the need to champion the cause of Spanish traditionalists. Or, he may have thought that his career as a publicist was not compatible with his new academic position as the head of a university department. In any case, he managed to write an inaugural lecture, "An Introduction to Spanish Culture," which completely avoided any explicit reference to recent Spanish events. Instead, Parker focused on the way in which medieval and Golden Age literature manifest the Spaniards' enduring virtues—their humor, common sense, dignity, and independence, as well as their "democratic sense of the essential equality in dignity of all men irrespective of their stations in society."⁶⁹ In his concluding remarks, Parker emphasizes that the Spanish form of democracy is "different to that usually understood by the term," because "[t]here is in Spanish culture no desire to depreciate or to destroy the principle of aristocracy. It is never denied that aristocracy has high ideals. But it is vigorously affirmed that the lowest classes also have these same ideals."⁷⁰

Parker ends his talk rather obscurely, with what seems like an oblique attempt to separate Spanish traditionalism from German and Italian fascism (and perhaps Soviet Communism as well), while at the same time shoring up the institutional status of his own academic field:

[T]o-day when in so large a part of Europe the value and independence of the individual is denied, when he is made a small and unimportant part of a standardized uniform mass, when the good of the State or race is everything and man himself nothing, the message of Spain and Spanish culture stands out vividly as a vital element in the Christian tradition

of European civilization. It is because Spain has never betrayed all that is best in the European tradition, that a University, which is itself an ancient part of this tradition and was founded to uphold it, cannot afford to ignore her or her culture.⁷¹

Parker's position here is exceedingly vague, leaving one to wonder, among other things, whether he is arguing that Franco's Spain continues to embody "all that is best in the European tradition." On the other hand, this kind of ambiguity was probably an appropriate—and perhaps inevitable—rhetorical position to adopt for a young Spanish professor and Franco sympathizer whose country was about to declare war on the *caudillo*'s principal allies.

Parker's inaugural lecture signaled the beginning of what would become an extraordinarily successful career as a Hispanist specializing in the Golden Age. From 1940 on, Parker's non-scholarly publications would be few and far between, and they would never again reach the frequency or the tone of his early writings (which were largely excluded from his later bibliographies⁷²). When he did publish in mainstream journals, he focused more on literature and religion than on Spanish politics.

How should one construe the relation between Parker's later scholarly work and his earlier production as a militant Catholic publicist? What connects both sets of texts, I would submit, is Parker's overriding preoccupation with morality—that which, in his first piece on the Republic, he had called a "standard of sane living." What attracts him to Golden Age Spanish literature is, more than anything else, its capacity to teach twentieth-century humanity invaluable moral lessons—particularly, proper humility in the face of divine authority. Put bluntly, Parker loved Spain because it was a Catholic country and because he believed that only Catholic values could save the world from impending disaster. Early in life, Parker discovered in the Spanish peasantry, and their premodern existence and worldview, a rich source of moral inspiration—one that he believed could serve as an example for his own countrymen and, by extension, to the world. Spanish history, too, particularly from the fifteenth century on, proved morally inspiring. Arguably, the bulk of Parker's Hispanist scholarship aims to make much the same point about Golden Age Spanish literature.

Thus, although around 1940, Parker's mode of expression and his subject matter underwent a marked shift toward academic literary

studies, this shift did not fundamentally affect what attracted him to Spain and what impelled him to dedicate his life to producing and disseminating knowledge of the country and its culture. His dedication to scholarly rigor was genuine and valuable, as was his intellectual honesty. But, *pace* Round, detaching Parker's rigor from his "metaphysics" or ideology—that is, from the affective, moral, and political factors that drove him—is impossible. In Parker's case, discipline, religious commitment and Hispanophilia are much too closely intertwined, and it is his religious commitment that carries the day.

PARKER AND THE FRANCO REGIME

All this means that Parker's relationship to Francoism was a complicated one. While he sympathized with the traditionalist movements that provided the basic ideology for Franco's *Movimiento*, he was suspicious of the Falange insofar as it seemed to propagate modernization and social change, subordinating religion to nationalism.⁷³ Moreover, if, in 1938, he had already expressed some doubts about the church's enthusiastic endorsement of Franco's military "crusade," he must, like Peers, eventually have had more serious misgivings about the dictator's postwar policy of repression, revenge, censorship, and political division. And yet, if Parker had these reservations, there is very little indication of them in his published record. Why?

For one, his withdrawal from the mainstream media left him with little room for public reflection on contemporary Spain. He might well have continued to believe, as he did in the 1930s, that politics were only of trivial importance. More likely is the possibility that Parker, by now a full-fledged academic, did not think it appropriate for a professor of Spanish literature to register his disagreement with the policies of Spain's head of state.⁷⁴ In this sense, the postwar professionalization of British Hispanism resulted in a depoliticization that, in effect, encouraged many of its practitioners to accept the Franco regime as a normal state of affairs—or at least not something to concern themselves with—and not to question the legitimacy of its academic institutions in any serious way.

It seems that Parker, too, was quite willing to tolerate and work with the post-Civil War status quo. In 1948, for instance, he wrote a glowing account of the official celebrations around the fourth centenary of Cervantes's birth in October the year before.⁷⁵ More important,

Parker's work as a Hispanist did much more to support the basic tenets of Francoist ideology than to undermine them. His lifelong insistence on the quality and interest of Spanish Counter-Reformation culture, and especially on the fundamental *catholicity* of that culture, provided a strong scholarly basis for the regime's definition of Spanish national identity as rooted in its religious zeal, and the identification of the country's past and future glory with its faithfulness to Catholic values. Parker, moreover, was as committed as the regime to vindicating the virtues and heroism of Spanish history—including the Conquest and the forcible imposition of religious unity—against its negative constructions in the Protestant North.⁷⁶ In a lecture he gave in April 1951 at the Ateneo in Madrid, he argued that Spanish humanism was more “true, healthy and complete” than its Renaissance variety elsewhere, because it never placed the human above the divine.⁷⁷ Twentieth-century humanity, therefore, would do well to heed the principal lessons of Spain's “Christian Humanism.”⁷⁸

In 1953, the year Parker was appointed to the prestigious Cervantes chair at King's College, London, he became an advisor to the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC), the principal academic institution in Franco's Spain. Also in 1953, however, Parker published a long essay in the *Cambridge Journal* that stands out in his bibliography for engaging directly, and more critically than at any other moment, with the main currents of Spanish conservative thought of the period. This essay, which is the one cited by Round, addresses the importance in Spanish intellectual history of the “morbid” obsession with the nation's “decadence”—an obsession that, Parker argues, has polarized intellectual and political life, reduced the quality of intellectual discourse, and made it impossible for the Spaniards to analyze their own situation with any kind of common sense. Although Parker lays the blame for this development on the Spanish liberals and their “extremist” tendency to demonize the country's religious past,⁷⁹ the brunt of his criticism is reserved for the contemporary intellectual Right—that is, for the hegemonic intellectual trends in Franco's Spain.

Parker is particularly skeptical about the much-touted notion that Spain's historical role as a “powerful champion of Catholicism” can be projected into the present and even into the future, postulating for the country a divinely assigned “destiny” in world history consisting of “the defence and propagation of the Kingdom of Christ on earth.” This kind of mystification is more than Parker's empiricist common

sense can bear. He understands the desire of Catholics to “defend and strengthen Catholicism within the frontiers of their country and propagate it beyond them.” But, he adds, “it needs no non-Catholic” to point out three fundamental problems. First, “the close association of religion with politics . . . raises . . . debatable issues”; second, “the survival of a nation as a nation being made to depend upon the political support of a particular religion . . . is founded neither on reason nor on history”; and third, “the belief in a national destiny, in the sense of a divinely appointed mission, is in no way warranted by belief in the existence of a providential order in history” (460). Surveying the state of conservative thought in Spain, Parker sees “alarming tendencies” and “philosophical aberrations” (470).

The climax of Parker’s essay signals, in a sense, the triumph of empiricism over faith. After a benevolent analysis of the work of Menéndez Pidal and Américo Castro, he predicts that Spain’s dilemma will not be solved until the obsession with the past is banned from political discourse. “[H]istory,” he writes, “should be left to the professional specialists.” Parker trusts that a dispassionate analysis of Spanish history will easily debunk the Right’s basic tenets. The truth, of course, will not necessarily be pleasant. To begin with, “it should not be too readily taken for granted that Spanish culture is a profoundly religious one”—in fact, “[d]uring the last century and a half, in particular, there can surely be no questioning that the finest manifestations of Catholic spirituality, thought and culture . . . have come from France.” If the Spaniards have been unable to see this, it is because they have been too obsessed with their own perceived decadence and become too intellectually isolated. “[T]his isolationism,” Parker adds, “is particularly prevalent . . . among the Right.” For starters, it would help if Spaniards “travelled more abroad and if their educational system . . . allowed more place for the study of foreign cultures” (473).

What is striking in this text is not only the way in which Parker leverages empiricist rigor—as well as his authority as an expert of things Spanish—to undermine some of the most basic tenets of Francoist ideology and to denounce the consequences of the regime’s policy of cultural and intellectual isolation. Remarkable, too, is that Parker, in the process, repudiates some of the ideas that he himself had propagated as a young Catholic publicist twenty years earlier. In this sense, the essay signals an important moment in Parker’s career

and, indeed, in the relationship between British Hispanism and Francoist Spain.

But the essay also illustrates the limits of postwar British Hispanism as a tool of political critique. Throughout, Parker never ventures beyond the realm of the history of literature and ideas. If he takes on the Spanish Right, it is at a purely intellectual level; there is not a word about the actual domestic or international politics of the Franco regime—the existence of censorship is not explicitly mentioned, for instance, let alone other forms of social and political repression. To the contrary, Parker's recommendations encourage a *clearer* separation between politics and intellectual activity, or between politics and culture in the widest sense. In the same vein, he ends his essay with a plea for a change in European foreign policy vis-à-vis Franco's Spain. The country, he writes, can only overcome its isolation if Europe stops ostracizing it. "It is sad," Parker states, "that political issues should cloud what is really a question of human relations"; "an attitude of blunt accusation and condemnation, however directed, is inappropriate to the real nature of the problems underlying the Spanish political situation" (473–74).

As far as I have been able to ascertain, this was one of the very few times that Parker pronounced himself so explicitly and publicly about the political situation in postwar Spain. His case is symptomatic of the ambivalent relationship of British Hispanists to Spain after the Civil War. Although the discipline remained generally rooted in a notion of Spain as different from the rest of Europe—and many of its practitioners were skeptical of the ambitions of Spanish liberalism—Hispanists had an increasingly hard time stomaching the rhetorical excesses to which the regime drove this notion. And yet, the structure of the field left little room for Spanish professors to voice their discontent beyond the call for a "dispassionate" approach to cultural history, for mutual "tolerance," and for separating politics from "human relations." Moreover, as Paul Julian Smith has pointed out, the basic tenets of the Parker school—the rigorous study of Literature, capital L, as a source of moral lessons about Man in his relationship to the Cosmos—proved highly constraining when it came to discerning or appreciating the dissident and dissonant aspects of Spanish cultural history.⁸⁰ To be sure, not all British Hispanists were as conservative as Peers and Parker. But the reactionary genealogy of the discipline (evident even in Parker), together with the depoliticization that came with its postwar professionalization, left the J. B. Trends and Helen

Grants with very little room to translate their progressive politics into relevant Hispanist practice. It was no surprise that the more progressively oriented students of the 1950s and '60s, who wanted to integrate the study of literature with that of society, history, and politics, gravitated toward Latin America.

While the Spanish Civil War did much to boost British interest in Spain generally, then, its impact on Hispanism was largely negative. On a practical level, the war years interrupted academic travel and research in Spain for close to a decade. Even in the postwar years, however, the dictatorship put a damper on the interactions of British academics with Spain, including those who had initially sympathized with the Nationalists and who maintained generally cordial relations with the regime's institutions and representatives.

THE RISE OF HISPANIST HISTORY

Around the same time that increasing numbers of literary Hispanists began turning toward Latin America, the British university saw the birth of a Hispanist historiography whose relationship to Spain was quite different from that of its literary counterpart.⁸¹ Unlike British literary Hispanism, the younger generation of historians of Spain was not burdened by a disciplinary genealogy rooted in romanticism, reaction, and religion. To the contrary, they consciously rejected that tradition, insisting instead on seeing Spain as just another European country, albeit with certain distinctive features. Taking their cue from Brenan's groundbreaking sociohistorical analyses, while ignoring his residual romanticism, they resolved to map, in a scholarly rigorous way, what was then a practically virgin field. And they did so armed with a British proclivity for objectivity and empiricism, the liberal (but by no means radical) outlook of whiggish historiography, and an instinctive allergy toward notions of national character and other romantic myths.

The moment was propitious. The interest in the Second World War was waning after having occupied European historians for two decades, and the British university system was undergoing a significant expansion.⁸² The historiography of Spain, meanwhile, particularly of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, was not only practically nonexistent in English academia—with the exception of Brenan's lonely book—but its development in Spain itself had also been

severely hampered by the war and the Franco dictatorship. Bent on strictly controlling all discourse about the country's history, the regime had all but destroyed the historiographical profession.⁸³ Although foreign historians had also suffered from the restrictions imposed by the regime—particularly in terms of access to archives—their work, free from the censorship that plagued their Spanish colleagues, filled an important gap. This was true for British scholars of imperial Spain like Henry Kamen and John H. Elliott, as much as for students of more recent Spanish history, where pioneers such as Raymond Carr and Hugh Thomas had the field largely to themselves. Moreover, this generation of Hispanist historians, who had entered the profession in the 1950s, soon managed to attract a younger generation—both British and Spanish—who helped turn Spanish historiography into a full-fledged academic field in the British university. Among these younger historians, moreover, were various left-leaning young academics whose interest in twentieth-century Spanish history was closely connected with their solidarity in the political struggle against Franco.⁸⁴

This latter generation, whose most prominent representative is Paul Preston, falls beyond the scope of this book, but I do want to say a couple of things about Raymond Carr and Hugh Thomas. Although Carr was only eleven years younger than Alexander Parker, he got off to a much later academic start. Born in Bath in 1919, Carr had grown up in Dorset, where his father was a schoolteacher and his mother worked in a post office.⁸⁵ In 1938, after spending some time studying in France and Germany to learn languages, Carr went to Christ College, Oxford, as a scholarship boy. Having been raised with few books, it was at Oxford that he discovered the joys of reading, devouring novels as much as scholarly works. He graduated in 1941 with a first-class degree and spent the war years teaching at a public school, after which he returned to Oxford to teach history at All Souls. His initial interest was Sweden; later, he thought of working on Italy. Spain landed in his lap almost by chance. He had first set foot in the country during his honeymoon at Torremolinos in 1950.⁸⁶ Two years later, Carr—by now a fellow at New College, Oxford—was asked to approach Gerald Brenan about writing the volume on Spain for the Oxford History of Modern Europe. When Brenan declined, it occurred to Carr that he could do the job himself. Fourteen years later, *Spain, 1808–1939* appeared, Carr's first and most influential work, later expanded into *Spain, 1808–1975*. The book's tremendous scope and detail, the enormous amount and diversity of sources consulted (Carr

prided himself on including novels in his bibliography), as well as its accessible style, assured that its principal thesis became the dominant explanatory paradigm for decades to come. Put briefly, this thesis was that Spain's turbulent twentieth-century history should be explained “in terms of the long-term historical failure of the middle classes to overcome the resistance of a recalcitrant landed oligarchy to the political, economic, and intellectual modernization of the country.”⁸⁷

Carr's work marks a significant break within the tradition of British Hispanism. While it manifests a certain sensitivity and affection for Spain and the Spaniards, it is not by any means the work of a Hispanophile in the style of Parker, Peers, Brenan, or even Trend. Carr, to be sure, is driven by a desire to *understand* Spanish history in all its aspects, but he feels no apparent need to defend or exculpate it, and even less to sing its praises. For Carr, moreover, understanding Spain is a purely intellectual enterprise. He rejects, from the outset, any notion of a Spanish national character, as well as other mystifying and exceptionalist ideas about the country and its history. He has always thought, as he writes in the introduction to *Spain: A History*, that Spain “should be studied as one would study the history of any other major European country.”⁸⁸ It is for the same reason that Carr has never liked being called a “Hispanist,” a term that, he believes, seems to evoke the need for a kind of spiritual communion between the country and the foreigners who study it.⁸⁹

Carr's work is marked by the fact that he drifted into the field by chance, later in life, and remarkably free of Hispanophile baggage. He had not “fallen in love” with the country at any particular stage in its development, and had not really paid attention to it before approaching its history from a scholarly perspective. (Although he was twenty when the Civil War ended, it seems that the whole event largely passed him by.⁹⁰) More important, he seems never to have made an affective investment in any particular notion of Spanish culture, and he never came to identify with any of Spain's political factions. All of this allowed Carr to adopt an almost cavalier attitude toward Spain's political situation, which sets him apart not only from his predecessor Gerald Brenan, but also from younger scholars like Preston, Sebastian Balfour, Michael Richards, or Helen Graham, whose work is clearly marked by a basic identification with the Spanish Left before, during, and after the Civil War.⁹¹

In his detachment, Carr is similar to Hugh Thomas who, although twelve years his junior, published his monumental *The Spanish Civil*

War in 1961, five years before Carr's first book. Like Carr, Thomas had stumbled on Spain as a subject more or less by chance, and was lucky enough to find the field practically free for the taking. His book, moreover—an impressive feat in terms of research and scope—appeared right when the public was ready for it. It was an immediate commercial success and was read and translated widely—even in Spain, where it was forbidden to circulate, but where its ostentatious objectivity was experienced like a breath of fresh air. As Preston writes, Thomas's book “did an enormous amount to popularize the subject but it constitutes a readable compendium of information rather than a major historiographical landmark.”⁹²

Within this book's triple framework of Hispanophilia, commitment, and discipline, Carr and Thomas stand out for the remarkable weakness in their profile of the affective and political component, compared to their explicit commitment to a particular kind of disciplinary rigor. Their approach to Spanish history is dispassionate in part because they emphatically write as liberal-minded Englishmen with no particular investment in the peculiarities of Spanish politics and culture. As we saw when discussing Southworth's work, this attitude also leads them to identify scholarly objectivity with a basic kind of equanimity vis-à-vis Spain's turbulent political landscape. Southworth pointed out in the 1970s how the very structure of Thomas's work reflected this stance: Thomas had clearly made sure carefully to alternate accounts of Nationalist atrocities with excesses on the Republican side, suggesting an equal distribution of blame and suffering.⁹³ In those instances where Nationalists and Loyalists disagreed over events of the war or their interpretation, Thomas similarly tended to adopt a position somewhere in the middle. The problem with objectivity thus understood, Southworth argued, was that Thomas consistently gave the Nationalist versions more credit than they deserved from a rigorous scholarly standpoint. In his last, posthumously published book, Southworth intensified his critique of Thomas in this respect, suggesting that Thomas's insistence on equanimity ended up “institutionalizing” skewed accounts of certain key events that later were gladly adopted by historians critical of the Loyalists.⁹⁴ Southworth was equally enraged by Carr's insistence on non-partisanship, which, in the 1970s, led Carr to include an essay by Ricardo de la Cierva, the Francoist functionary who, in the 1960s, had become the regime's house Civil War historian, in an academic collection.⁹⁵ In Southworth's eyes, Carr and Thomas proved once

again that, in the case of the Spanish Civil War, scholarly rigor was paramount, as was objectivity and intellectual honesty—but that neither rigor nor objectivity could ever imply political neutrality.

After Franco's death, historiography in Spain quickly managed to make up for decades of lost time, turning itself into a full-fledged and prolific academic discipline. But, while most Spanish scholars generously acknowledged their debt to the foreign *hispanistas*, particularly those in Britain and the United States, they also began to formulate nuanced critiques of their Anglophone colleagues' work and approach. Historians like Ángela Cenarro, Julián Casanova, Enrique Moradiellos, and Abdón Mateos have recognized the merits of English and American historiography of contemporary Spain—its readability, its synthetic sweep—but have also pointed out some of its weaknesses. Among these, they have highlighted a pervasive methodological conservatism; a tendency to focus on political and cultural elites, conceived as individual agents and principal shapers of historical processes (and a corresponding neglect of social history); and the whiggish habit of measuring Spain's evolution by an implicit British yardstick.⁹⁶

More recently, a younger generation of British historians has begun to question their seniors' heavy reliance on empiricism. As Simon Doubleday has pointed out, the prestige of British historians in Spain long rested on their reputation as levelheaded, impartial observers whose sympathy for Spain and its people never descends into the kind of blind partisanship that mars most of Spanish historians' work.⁹⁷ The English giants of Spanish history have been more than willing to confirm this image. "I would like to think that the effort to be fair-minded, and to abandon prejudice," John Elliott declared in 1996, "has been an important contribution of British Hispanism."⁹⁸ The value of empiricism, he wrote elsewhere, lies, among other things, in its "punctuating inflated rhetoric and forcing on the attention of those trained in a different form of discourse the sometimes awkward presence of uncongenial facts."⁹⁹ But, as Doubleday argues, empiricism is no guarantee for disinterestedness; it can just as likely serve to mask particular interests. "[E]ven the most empirical scholarship," he writes, "betrays its own discursivity, its own private, collective, and/or political inclinations," and "temperamental and imaginative affinities . . . play a far larger role in the shaping of Hispanic studies than might be presumed."¹⁰⁰ "Empiricism, therefore," Doubleday concludes, "is not to be confused with detached objectivity; Hispanists

such as John Elliott are clearly and deeply attached. The real question is defining the nature of the attachment.”¹⁰¹

In an interview from 1996, in fact, Elliott formulates some interesting thoughts on the relationship between Hispanophilia and what he calls “fair-mindedness.” On the one hand, he identifies the tradition of British Hispanism, going back to Ford, with a capacity for honest critique; on the other, he relates this capacity to a particular form of affection: “Perhaps those who love a country have an especially pronounced awareness of its defects, or presumed defects; and given that they feel they are among friends, they sometimes speak with the frankness that tends to accompany real friendship.”¹⁰² To be sure, Elliott also admits that British Hispanism includes a romanticizing strain, which insists on seeing Spain as picturesque and exotic—and which, paradoxically, provides the basis for the foreigner’s affection:

Romantics like Borrow and Ford are to a certain extent searching for their own identity in another country, and perhaps one can say the same thing of any historian today who works on another country: I myself don’t know if I have found my identity in Spain, but I have found another identity that is now part of my own. I have discovered it in Spain and that is why I identify with its people, because if one is working on the history of another country it is necessary to put oneself in its people’s place and try to think like them to understand them better. This effort to understand is part of the identification process.¹⁰³

For Elliott, too, the tension between Hispanophilia and scholarly rigor remains largely unresolved.

* * *

Recent developments in British Hispanism, particularly the advent of cultural studies, have led to a series of new and fruitful collaborations between historians and literary critics. Thanks in part to this interdisciplinary rapprochement—which, in a sense, signals a return to the philological notion of Hispanism as a multidisciplinary field dealing with Spain in the largest sense¹⁰⁴—literary Hispanism has largely managed to shed the reactionary, romantic legacy that burdened most of its twentieth-century development. For Hispanist historians, in turn, the impact of cultural studies has allowed for a shift in focus from political to social and cultural history.

We already saw how the generations of British historians following Carr and Thomas, beginning with that of Paul Preston, do not make

a claim to political neutrality in their approach to Spain. They discovered Spain in the 1960s and '70s as it was struggling to free itself from dictatorship, and naturally aligned themselves with that struggle—an alignment that also colored their view of the Second Republic and the Civil War. As Preston writes in one of his latest books, as a historian, he does not aim “to find a perfect balance between both sides”: “Despite what Franco supporters claim, I do not believe that Spain derived any benefit from the military rising of 1936 and the military victory of 1939.” His account, he writes, reflects “little sympathy . . . for the Spanish right, but I hope there is some understanding.”¹⁰⁵ The impact of the cultural-studies model—rooted, as it tends to be, in a basic form of progressive social or political commitment—has further encouraged subsequent generations of Hispanists to reject claims to impartiality. One could say, then, that the new British Hispanism is more up front about the fact that it is not solely driven by the disinterested pursuit of truth, as Peers claimed to be, but also by affective and political factors. This does not necessarily mean, of course, that the tension among these three driving factors has become any easier to negotiate.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 10



CONCLUSION

LEGITIMACY AND SPANISH CIVIL WAR DISCOURSE

Almost from the day of its outbreak, the military conflict in Spain gave rise to a parallel “war of words,” as Preston calls it, a discursive battle that was fought within Spain as much as outside it. And contrary to the war itself, this war of words did not end on April 1, 1939. In fact, even today it is far from over.¹ At dispute in this discursive struggle have not only been the facts about the war—the place, circumstances, and number of casualties; the level and nature of atrocities committed on both sides; the presence or absence of foreign agents and soldiers, and so on—but how the facts should be interpreted, what they *meant*. More than seventy years and rivers of ink later (it is estimated that there are between fifteen and twenty thousand books on the topic²), the painstaking scholarship of Spanish and foreign historians, and the opening up of Spanish and Soviet archives, has considerably reduced the disagreement over what exactly happened between July 1936 and April 1939. Strikingly, though, the battle over the Civil War’s *interpretative framework* continues unabated on all fronts: in Spanish civil society, in the public spheres of the West, and within the international scholarly community. The reasons for this persistence of sharp disagreements over the meaning of the war are many. They include the emotional and political investments of particular constituencies in specific interpretations of the war, as well as contemporary interests and agendas of scholars, politicians, and social and political groups. The situation is further complicated by the fact that the Spanish Civil War is not just part of Spanish history, but occupies

a central space in many communities of memory throughout the world. Equally important is the fact that Spain, given Franco's long dictatorship and the dynamics of the subsequent transition to democracy, is still in the process of coming to terms with its recent past.

The competing narratives of the conflict are almost too many to list. Some have presented the war as primarily an international affair, either as a battle of democracy against fascism or of Western civilization against Communism. Others have seen the war chiefly as a Spanish phenomenon. Within this latter framework, some have emphasized the deep-seated socioeconomic problems of Spain as a root cause; others, the particular makeup of Spanish culture and Spanish "national character"; again others, the incompetence or irresponsibility of the country's political leaders. On the Republican side, the most salient long-term dispute, still unresolved, concerns the role of the Spanish Communists and their allies from the Communist International. Did the Communists' insistence on central control, their subservience to Stalin and Soviet interests, and their repression of spontaneous revolutionary initiatives strengthen or weaken the Republican chances of winning the war? What exactly were Stalin's plans and objectives in Spain?³ Within the pro-Nationalist camp, meanwhile, the monarchists, Catholic traditionalists, and Falangists all have competing stories to tell. As Herbert Southworth and Paloma Aguilar have shown, the Franco regime skillfully adapted its narrative of the war to its changing needs and circumstances, shifting from a representation of the war as a crusade—at first religious and anti-liberal, later anti-Communist—to a notion of the Civil War as a national "tragedy" or the result of "collective insanity."⁴ The battle over competing interpretations is further complicated by the fact that many of them depend on hypotheticals: What would have happened if France, England, and the United States had stood by the Republic? How would the war have progressed if the Communists had supported the popular revolution instead of repressing it? Would Hitler have dared to start World War II if he had not been given such a free hand in assisting Spain's military rebels? And so on.

The key assets in this seventy-year battle over the interpretation of the Civil War have been discursive legitimacy and authority. Who gets to speak, who is listened to, who is taken seriously? Who gets a book published, and where? Whose interpretations stick or become the standard version of a particular episode? Although different voices have dominated Civil War discourse at different times, the most important

have been participants and other witnesses; writers and public intellectuals; journalists; politicians and diplomats; religious and political leaders; and scholarly experts. Naturally, these categories overlap. Orwell, for instance, was a writer, public intellectual, and participant; some Western ambassadors to Spain wrote as diplomats as well as witnesses; and so forth. What interests me in this context is how these different public voices have staked out their claims to legitimacy and truth, while disputing those of their competitors. In their battle for the interpretative upper hand, groups and individuals have founded their claims to discursive authority on their personal experience; their intimate knowledge of Spain; their love of the country; their political credentials; the soundness of their moral or ethical stance or of their religious faith; and their status as experts in a particular scholarly discipline. In turn, they have questioned the legitimacy and authority of competing accounts by pointing out their bias; their lack of information; their adherence to an implicit or explicit political agenda; their nostalgia; their pigheadedness; their duplicity; and their lack of objectivity or professional training. This last point is of particular interest to me, because it goes to the heart of the dispute between professional academics and nonaffiliated scholars—a dispute of importance in Spanish Civil War studies, in which, as in Hispanism generally, scholars without academic training or affiliation have played a significant role.⁵

In this book, I have tried to show how the Spanish Civil War and its aftermath affected the academic study of Spain as it was practiced in Great Britain and the United States during the war years and the two or three decades following. I have argued that the sudden and intense politicization of Spain, and its launch into the foreground of media and public opinion, put British and American Hispanists in a difficult situation. In effect, the outbreak of the war placed conflicting demands on them as scholars, as friends and admirers of Spain, and as citizens. In the course of this book, particularly in its four biographical chapters, I have described this conflict as a tension among the imperatives of scholarly discipline, Hispanophilia, and commitment of a political, moral, ethical, or religious nature. In practice, determining their attitude and course of action vis-à-vis the war in Spain also obliged Hispanists to define or redefine their public role as experts on Spain, the scope and nature of their expertise, and the boundaries of their discipline.

In Great Britain, as much as the United States, the attempted military coup and subsequent outburst of civil conflict, however much it had been feared or expected, came as a great shock to the Hispanist community. The bloody events in Spain also immediately divided that community along political and religious lines. In both countries, a sizeable group of Hispanists were observing Catholics, had been drawn to Spain in part for religious reasons, and tended, therefore, to sympathize with the Nationalists. And while in both countries there were Hispanists of more liberal leanings whose natural sympathies lay with the Loyalists, the genealogy and structure of the discipline tended to favor conservatism over liberalism. Although the university was generally averse to the expression of extreme right- or left-wing ideas, it can be argued that British and American Hispanism left more room for reactionary positions than for a radically leftist stance. In fact, even some of the more liberal-leaning Hispanists were affectively invested in a notion of Spain as a premodern society fundamentally different from Europe—an image ultimately closer to that cherished by the traditionalist factions in Spain than to the notion of a modern, democratic, European Spain championed by most of the liberal sectors and some of the radical Left.

The most salient difference in the reactions to the war among British and American Hispanists concerned their willingness to participate in the passionate public debates on the social, political, and military situation in Spain. A handful of exceptions aside, American Hispanists largely abstained from pronouncing themselves on the Spanish Civil War at all; in fact, everything indicates that they avoided the subject as much as possible. They did so because the issue was seen, rightly, as deeply divisive, but also out of a concern for the institutional status of the discipline. This attitude was not limited to professors and teachers of Spanish. The debates in the scholarly journals about the challenges facing the modern languages given the developments in Europe in the 1930s show that American academics involved in the study of foreign languages and cultures overwhelmingly preferred to steer clear of contemporary political issues, in their classes as well as their scholarship. This attitude was motivated not only by the notion that scholarly rigor and “objectivity” demanded a bracketing of politics, especially contemporary politics, but also by their fear that any involvement in political debates might erode the precarious legitimacy of their disciplines and, therefore, their livelihood. It is in this sense that the twin pillars of disciplinarity—specialization and

institutionality—prevented academic Hispanists from taking an active role in the public debates about the Spanish Civil War. Ironically, then, it was, in the end, a concern for academic legitimacy that barred Hispanists from speaking out on a subject in which they would have had more legitimacy than many of the other voices claiming privileged access to the “truth about Spain.” In practice, the war drove American Hispanists away from Spain. Under the influence of cultural and state-sponsored Pan-Americanism, many preferred to focus on Latin America instead. As it turns out, it took the Hispanist establishment almost two decades to begin participating in the debate about the meaning of the Spanish Civil War, and, even then, they did not do so without hesitation.

In Britain, where academics were more used to assuming prominent public roles, and where Hispanism was a smaller and less established institution, the situation was quite different. Several of the country’s most distinguished scholars immediately joined the debate about the war in Spain, as did some younger members of the profession. Interestingly, while most of the British public sympathized with the Republic, the most vocal of the Hispanists—Peers, Parker, and Atkinson—were either neutral or sympathetic to the Nationalist cause. In the cases of Peers and Parker, this political position was clearly rooted in their religious commitment, their conservative politics, and the nature of their affective investment in Spain as a quintessentially religious, traditional nation. Peers always denied that his politics affected his scholarly objectivity, but he never hid his love and admiration for Spanish culture and history, particularly its religious history.

* * *

Did the Spanish Civil War, on balance, have a positive or negative long-term effect on British and American Hispanism? This is difficult to determine; at best, one can say the results were mixed. It is true that the war did much to spark a much wider interest in Spanish culture and history—an interest that continues to exist, and that, in the short, as well as the long, run produced tremendously valuable work. It is significant that two of the most outstanding historians of the Spanish Civil War, Gerald Brenan and Herbert Southworth, were able to turn their shock and outrage over the war, as well as their love of Spain, into a durable source of intellectual energy capable of fueling years of tireless scholarly labor. It is also telling, however, that both produced their groundbreaking work on Spanish history from positions

outside of the academic world. They themselves were convinced that they could not have done their kind of work from within a British or American university, and they were right. Throughout much of the postwar period, academic Hispanism in both countries proved too depoliticized, specialized, and conservative an institution to take on the war as a topic of serious scholarly discussion and investigation. Instead, academic Hispanism appeared largely willing to accept the Franco regime as the new status quo. Of course, this did not mean that many Hispanists were not distressed by Franco and his politics, or concerned over the plight of the Spanish people. Even some of those who, like Peers and Parker, had initially sympathized with the Nationalists were eventually unhappy with the *caudillo*'s ruthless and divisive postwar policies, no doubt finding themselves thinking, much like Ortega y Gasset with respect to the Second Republic, "*No es esto, no es esto!*" [This isn't it, this isn't it!].

In both countries, however, the institution of Hispanism provided little or no room for consideration, let alone a critique, of the political situation in contemporary Spain. I have suggested that this was mainly due to two factors: first, to the progressive professionalization, specialization, and concomitant depoliticization of academic Hispanism, which placed an increased emphasis on rigor, method, and "pure" literary studies; and second, to the *institutional* investment of Hispanism as a discipline in a fundamentally conservative, even reactionary, notion of Spanish history and culture. This notion was not all that different from the one propagated by the Franco regime. It was also a notion that, as an ideology of Hispanism that construed Spanish culture as more "spiritual" than other European cultures, prevailed even among some of the Spanish liberals whose exile from Franco's Spain landed them in American and British Spanish departments.

As we saw in Chapter 4, the ideology of Hispanism meshed relatively well with the depoliticized liberal humanism prevalent in the academic humanities during the first two decades of the Cold War. And while the presence of Francoism did little to counteract the naturally conservative tendencies of British and American Hispanism, it did equally little to remedy its chronic marginalization. During most of the Cold War, the discipline's institutional status vis-à-vis other humanistic fields mirrored Spain's position on the margins of the West. As a result, those scholars drawn to Hispanic culture who were interested in more progressive positions, or in a more politicized academic practice, tended to gravitate toward Latin America. In the

United States, in particular, Latin American studies increasingly offered attractive institutional perks—not only lavish funding from foundations and the federal government but also, eventually, considerable academic prestige.

Hispanists' adherence to a notion of rigorous, professional, and specialized scholarship as a depolitized academic practice in effect implied that large aspects of Spanish history, culture, and society were considered off-limits to humanistic inquiry. I have suggested that this notion of scholarship should be seen in the context of the field's struggle for legitimacy in American and British academia. The discipline of Hispanism as a humanistic form of scholarship, like all other disciplines, founded its authority and legitimacy on the twin concepts of specialization and institutionality. If, since the introduction of the German university model in the late nineteenth century, the humanities have tried to argue that their kind of inquiry is just as "scientific" as that of the natural and social sciences, Hispanism was faced with the added burden of proving its scholarly worth *vis-à-vis* its more prestigious competitors in the modern languages. Throughout the field's institutional history, then, Hispanists have been faced with the need to explain, time and again, the importance and legitimacy of their expertise. This continued marginalization has had two main consequences. First, it instilled a fundamental insecurity at the heart of the discipline, a fear of being perceived as not scholarly or professional enough. Second, within the modern languages and European historiography, it compelled Hispanists, at key periods, to found their academic prestige on the prestige of their object of study, that is, Spain. Hispanists saw it as part of their job to sing the praise of Spain and its culture, mobilizing their Hispanophilia in a never-ending public relations campaign. In the U.S. context, this particular strategy was in perpetual tension with the equally important reliance on Pan-Americanism.⁶

For American and British Hispanists, Hispanophilia and the belief in the greatness of Spain and its culture did not always sit comfortably with their patriotic loyalties to their own countries. As Kagan and others have shown, the history of Anglo-American Hispanism is, in fact, closely intertwined with the use of Spain's history of imperial and cultural decline as a contrastive tool to emphasize the virtues and future promise of Britain and the United States.⁷ After World War I, moreover, American Hispanists in particular were increasingly aware of the possibility that the outside world might interpret their dedication to,

and love for, another country—not to mention their commitment to sharing that love with their students—as a dangerous sign of disloyalty. It was not for nothing that Lawrence Wilkins, the first president of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish, while making the case for Spanish against German, emphasized that an interest in foreign cultures should never supersede the love of one's own.⁸

If Hispanophilia and the need to argue for the greatness of Spanish culture was a source of tension for American Hispanists, this was not the case for the hundreds of Spanish academics who entered American Spanish departments beginning in the late 1930s. As we have seen, their influx had three main effects. First, it counterbalanced the growing turn toward Latin America among American Hispanists, which had been fueled by the Pan-Americanist Good Neighbor Policy and Hispanists' reluctance to deal with Civil War Spain. Second, it bolstered the notion that it was part of a Hispanist's job to define and defend the greatness of Spanish culture. And third, it confirmed the profile of Peninsular Hispanism as a methodologically and politically conservative discipline. As said, in the 1940s and '50s, the celebration of Spanish culture as a unique source of spirituality within materialist Western modernity dovetailed with the depoliticized ideology of culture that predominated in the American humanities. But when, in the late 1960s, many of the humanistic disciplines became politicized and began questioning their own institutional status, exposing previously unquestioned complicities in repressive power structures, Peninsular Hispanism—invested as it was in the defense of a marginal cultural heritage whose basis was, nevertheless, imperial—was not ready to join the revolution. British Hispanism, too, largely missed the revolutionary boat of 1968 and its aftermath, and remained under the influence of the postwar generation, particularly the Parker school.

This evolution of British and American Hispanism further complicates the relationship between institutionalized Hispanists and their nonaffiliated colleagues, particularly within the discourse on the Spanish Civil War. With respect to American literary Hispanism, for instance, Resina has drawn attention to the territorial behavior displayed by Paul Ilie, who, in the 1980s, as part of an attempt to defend the value of Spanish literature produced under Franco, dismissed Chomsky's contribution to the Civil War debate by emphasizing the linguist's lack of disciplinary credentials. Apparently, Resina writes, Ilie felt it "incumbent upon himself to reprove Chomsky *qua* Hispanist," by "impugning Chomsky's sources, notably those with a popular or

revolutionary background.” However, as Resina points out, in this way Ilie ironically confirmed Chomsky’s point about liberal scholarship in his critique of Gabriel Jackson, “unwittingly reproduc[ing] the bias for which Chomsky had taken Jackson to task.” Ilie’s dismissal of Chomsky as an amateur, moreover, indirectly expressed an institutional solidarity with Jackson based on “affinities between the historian and the literary scholar . . . that rested on their status as ‘specialists.’”⁹ A similar dynamic can be discerned in the British context; witness the hostile and dismissive reactions to Brenan’s work of established academics like Peers and Parker.

It is worth noting that, in American and British Hispanist historiography, relations between institutional academics and nonaffiliated scholars have been more cordial and receptive. The work of Southworth and Bolloten, for instance, has been generally met with benevolence and admiration by established historians on both sides of the Atlantic. Gabriel Jackson invited Southworth to the University of California at San Diego for a brief visiting professorship in the early 1970s, and has always spoken in positive terms of the Oklahoman’s work, as have Spanish and British scholars like Ángel Viñas and Paul Preston.¹⁰ Conservative historians like Stanley Payne, on the other hand, have, at times, adopted a more acerbic tone.¹¹

Still, it is clear that nonaffiliated, “amateur” scholars like Southworth, lacking the institutional authority of their academic colleagues, have had a harder time in making their voices heard and in being taken seriously. The Francoist historian Ricardo de la Cierva and his assistants, in their desperate attempts to counteract Southworth’s exposés, were all too eager to point to Southworth’s status as an autodidact historian without institutional credentials. “Herbert Rutledge Southworth, que no es ni siquiera un buen bibliógrafo—no es más que un feroz devorador de libros—” the anonymous reviewer of *El mito de la cruzada de Franco* wrote in the official *Boletín bibliográfico*,

estaba muy poco preparado para hacer historia contemporánea española. . . . El apasionamiento desvaloriza cualquier estudio histórico; pero, sobre todo, aniquila un trabajo de crítica bibliográfica. Incluso críticos que simpatizan con Herbert Rutledge Southworth han repudiado su actitud.¹²

Herbert Rutledge Southworth, who is not even a good bibliographer—he is no more than a ferocious devourer of books—was only minimally prepared to write contemporary Spanish history. . . . Passion devalues

any historical study; above all, however, it destroys a work of bibliographical critique. Even those critics who sympathize with Herbert Rutledge Southworth have disowned his attitude.

Similarly, the conservative pundit César Vidal discredited Southworth's work in the obituary note he wrote for the conservative Spanish newspaper *El Mundo*, affirming that the Oklahoman "was never a historian."¹³ Even Hugh Thomas—something of an amateur historian of Spain himself—could not resist the temptation, when reviewing Southworth's *La destruction de Guernica* for the *Times Literary Supplement*, to introduce the author as a well-meaning, but slightly eccentric and immoderate, autodidact. Southworth, Thomas wrote, was "a self-educated Texan" whose "hostility towards the Franco regime simmered" for years, and whose first book "established [him] as a formidable polemicist."¹⁴ Thomas added, however, that Southworth lacked the "equitable spirit" necessary to understand why prominent English intellectuals like Douglas Jerrold (a friend of Thomas's) chose to support Franco. A piqued Southworth replied that he had studied at the University of Arizona, Texas Technological College, and Columbia University, and that he held a "doctorate from the Sorbonne."¹⁵

In the four biographical chapters, I have tried to show that, in the British and American context, the lack of institutional affiliation also came with certain freedoms and opportunities less available to academic Hispanists. The case of Southworth, especially when compared to that of Rogers, seems to suggest that the nonaffiliated Hispanist may have had less difficulty integrating Hispanophilia and political commitment with an equally strong dedication to scholarly rigor. Southworth, as said, was convinced that he would have never been able to do the kind of work he did if he had been working at an American university. In the early 1940s, when he submitted a manuscript of a book dealing with Spanish fascism to Harcourt, Brace, the publishers told him it was too academic. This comment surprised him: "Personally I never felt comfortable in American universities," he wrote in 1986. "I never believed that the truth could be found in the universities that I had known. Surely I would have been more comfortable in a European institution. An academic career for someone truly leftist is, or was in my time, almost impossible in the United States, for purely political reasons."¹⁶ My account of Paul Rogers' life and work bears this out.

The cases of Peers and Parker illustrate the complications involved in scholars' becoming public intellectuals when the subject of their expertise becomes the center of widespread political controversy. Unlike their American colleagues, they were not afraid to join the fray. But, in both cases, it is clear that, as they contemplated and analyzed events in Spain, it was impossible to neutralize the Hispanophile sentiments and religious beliefs that had drawn them to the country to begin with. Both had to pay a certain price for their politicization in the 1930s, although this is perhaps more evident in Peers' case than in Parker's. With reference to American Hispanism, a different argument can be made. Insofar as U.S. Hispanists defined their mission, *qua* scholars and teachers, as the disinterested pursuit of truth, their reluctance to engage in the wide-ranging and passionate debates on the culture, history, and politics of Spain that occupied many sectors of American society between 1936 and 1939 can be seen, at least in part, as a failure to heed that mission. Ironically, the specialization and institutionality that Hispanists saw as the guarantees of scholarly disinterestedness and discipline—and the foundation for their claims to legitimacy, authority, and prestige—discouraged them from fulfilling their scholarly mission in relation to events in contemporary Spain. Instead, they preferred to defer to journalists, politicians, diplomats, religious leaders, and public intellectuals—some of whom, over time, became authoritative Hispanists in their own right outside of the protective, and restrictive, walls of the university.

This page intentionally left blank

NOTES

CHAPTER 1

1. Ortega, “Concerning Pacifism,” 32. The Spanish original, entitled “En cuanto al pacifismo,” was included as an appendix to subsequent editions of Ortega’s 1929 collection of essays *La rebelión de las masas*.
2. Preston, “War of Words,” 4–5; Esenwein, “Cold War and Anglo-American Historiography.”
3. Sontag, *Regarding the Pain of Others*, 21.
4. Morán, *Maestro en el exilio*, 64–65.
5. Gullón, “Desde el exilio,” 23.
6. G. Morán, *Maestro*, 58.
7. Hopkins, *Into the Heart of Fire*, 113–16.
8. Kenwood, “Art, Propaganda, Commitment,” 30–31.
9. See Anderson, “Cultural Studies and Hispanisms”; Kagan, *Spain in America*; Moraña, *Ideologies of Hispanism*; Epps and Fernández Cifuentes, *Spain Beyond Spain*; Jordan, *British Hispanism*; Read, *Educating the Educators*; and Martín-Estudillo, Ocampo, and Spadaccini, “Debating Hispanic Studies.”
10. Resina, “Hispanism and Its Discontents”; Fernández, “Longfellow’s Law”; Álvarez Junco and Shubert, Introduction; Ucelay da Cal, “Ideas preconcebidas y estereotipos”; Jordan; Mariscal, “Introduction to the Ideology of Hispanism.”
11. Resina, “Discontents,” 115–16; Mariscal, “Introduction,” 3.
12. Kagan, “Introduction,” 2–3.
13. Britain had signed the Non-Intervention Pact; Roosevelt adhered to a policy of strict neutrality.
14. Artigas, “Clamor de infortunio.”
15. Ibid.
16. *Protección del tesoro bibliográfico nacional*.
17. Navarro Tomás, *A los hispanistas del mundo*.
18. Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes*, 144.
19. Shklar, *Political Thought*, 41.
20. Shumway and Dionne, Introduction, 1–2.
21. The Oxford English Dictionary defines “rigour” as “Severity in dealing with a person or persons; extreme strictness; harshness”; “The strict terms, application, or enforcement of some law, rule, etc.”; climatological severity or harshness; “Strictness of discipline, etc.; austerity of life”; and, finally, “Strict accuracy, severe exactitude.”
22. Bourdieu, *Homo Academicus*, 84.
23. Shumway and Dionne, Introduction, 2.
24. Moran, *Interdisciplinarity*, 2.
25. Graff, *Professing Literature*, 30–31, 72–74; Faber, “Economies of Prestige.”
26. Said, *Orientalism*, 9–10.
27. Preston, *Idealistas bajo las balas*, 419–36.

CHAPTER 2

1. Hemingway, *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, 209–10.
2. Among Spanish literary scholars, there has long been a notable suspicion of the foreign *hispanistas*. See Loureiro, “Desolación y miseria”; Fernández Cifuentes, “Discursos del método”; and Beltrán Almería, “Filología hispánica.”
3. Orwell, “Notes on Nationalism,” 865, 869.
4. *Ibid.*, 869.
5. Ian Buruma says about Anglophilia that it “is of course a fantasy, like all forms of -philia, which can easily degenerate into a form of pretending to be something you are not” (*Voltaire's Coconuts*, 11).
6. See Cenarro Lagunas, “Tradición y renovación,” 70–71; Moradiellos, “Espejo distante,” 21.
7. Burns Marañón, *Hispanomanía*, 110, 131, 125 (all translations mine).
8. See Praz, *Unromantic Spain*; Juderías, *Leyenda negra*, 177–85; Kagan, “Prescott’s Paradigm”; Ríos-Font, “National Literature in the Protean Nation,” 137–40.
9. Brenan, “Hispanophilia.”
10. Robertson, *Richard Ford*, 15.
11. Kagan, “Prescott’s,” 430–31.
12. The 1956 and 1970 editions of the *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española* specify that the term *hispanista* is commonly used for non-Spaniards.
13. Doubleday, “English Hispanists,” 208; Cenarro Lagunas, “Tradición,” 83–84.
14. “Between 1915 and 1922,” Leavitt writes in reference to U.S. secondary education, “it is estimated that German dropped from an enrollment of approximately 325,000 to less than 14,000, and that in the same period French increased from approximately 117,000 to 345,000, and Spanish from approximately 36,000 to 252,000” (“Teaching of Spanish,” 621).
15. Fernández, “Longfellow’s Law.”
16. Wilkins, “Spanish as a Substitute,” 207; quoted in Fernández, “Longfellow’s,” 55.
17. Wilkins, “President’s Address” (1919), 38; quoted in Fernández, “Longfellow’s,” 55.
18. Hespelt, “Spanish in a Changing World,” 2–3.
19. Amner, “Some Aspects of Nationalism,” 408–9.
20. *Ibid.*, 410.
21. Fife, “Nationalism and Scholarship,” 1286, 1287, 1290.
22. Hemingway, *For Whom*, 15.
23. *Ibid.*, 163. The Spaniards’ distrust of Jordan’s motives was echoed in 1969 by Camilo José Cela, who dedicated his novel *San Camilo 1936* to “the conscripts of 1937, all of whom lost something: their life, their freedom, their dreams, their hope, their decency,” but *not* to “the adventurers from abroad, Fascists and Marxists, who had their fill of killing Spaniards like rabbits and whom no one had invited to take part in our funeral” (Cela, *San Camilo*, ix, quoted in Mainer, “Reconstruir la España contemporánea,” 86).
24. As Mainer writes: “¿puede existir una inclinación a los estudios españoles por parte de un extranjero que no comporte algún ingrediente de interés político o algún elemento de comparación implícita?” [can a foreigner be inclined to Spanish studies without some ingredient of political interest or implicit comparison?] (Mainer, “Reconstruir,” 87).
25. Burns Marañón, *Hispanomanía*, 188.
26. Stimson, “Beginning of American Hispanism,” 482–83, 486.
27. Fernández has shown that North-American *cultural* interest in Spain has been generally spurred by a more direct *political or economic* interest in Latin America, a phenomenon for which he coins the phrase “Longfellow’s law”: “At the origins of U.S. interest in

Spanish we find the view that Spanish is an American language, with a history and, most important, a future as such. . . . [H]owever, this interest . . . for complex reasons . . . was translated in practice into an interest in the language, literature, and culture not of Latin America but of Spain. . . . In a sense, although the eyes of pragmatism looked south, the gaze and students and scholars became fixed on the east" ("Longfellow's," 50).

28. Said, *Orientalism*, 10.
29. Ibid., 39.
30. Ibid., 43.
31. Lewis, "We Must Be Clear." See also Irwin, *For Lust of Knowing*, 299–301.
32. Resina, "Hispanism and its Discontents"; Berger, *Under Northern Eyes*.
33. Lewis, "Must."
34. Buruma, "Lost in Translation," 186.
35. Ibid., 191.
36. "America Hispana, even more than the United States, is a half-world," he wrote; "With striking symmetry it has what the North lacks and lacks what the North has made for itself" (Frank, *America Hispana*, 339).
37. See, among others, Alonso, "Cultural Studies and Hispanism"; Anderson, "Cultural Studies and Hispanisms"; Avelar, "Toward a Genealogy"; Berger, *Under*; Beverley, et al., "A Little Azúcar"; Epps and Fernández Cifuentes, *Spain beyond Spain*; Faber, "La hora ha llegado"; Mariscal, "Introduction to the Ideology"; Martín-Estudillo, Ocampo, and Spadaccini, "Debating Hispanic Studies,"; Moraña, *Ideologies of Hispanism*; Moreiras, "Neohispanismo y política"; Read, "Travelling South"; Resina, "Discontents"; and Round, "Politics of Hispanism."
38. *Enciclopedia universal ilustrada europeo-americana*, 1st ed., s.v. hispanismo. The entry also indicates that *hispanismo* can be considered a synonym of *hispanofilia*.
39. The rise in Spanish students in the United States, for instance, "whose cause was at first purely mercantile, is already evolving and will become primarily cultural"; "U.S. historians, with their love of truth, their impartial criticism and their modern, document-based research methods, have initiated the vindication of Spanish history" (*ibid.*).
40. *Ibid.*
41. Shumway, "Hispanism in an Imperfect Past," 297; Faber, "Hora," 89–90.
42. Álvarez Junco and Shubert, Introduction, 10. See also Doubleday, "English Hispanists," 209.
43. See Resina, "Cold War Hispanism."
44. See Faber, "Economies of Prestige."
45. Cenarro Lagunas, "Tradición," 70–71.

CHAPTER 3

1. Horowitz, *Professors*.
2. Schrecker, "Worse Than McCarthy," 20.
3. Horowitz, "What I Told Pennsylvania's Academic Freedom Hearings."
4. American Association of University Professors, "1940 Statement of Principles."
5. See Graff, *Beyond the Culture Wars*; and Bérubé and Nelson, *Higher Education under Fire*.
6. For an analysis of this process in anthropology, see Rosaldo, *Culture and Truth*. For the evolution of the notion of objectivity in historiography, see Novick, *That Noble Dream*;

Haskell, “Objectivity Is Not Neutrality”; Kloppenburg, “Objectivity and Historicism”; and Evans, *In Defense of History*.

7. Lindholm-Romantschuk, “Disciplinarity”; Messer-Davidow, Shumway, and Sylvan, “Introduction”; Shumway and Messer-Davidow, “Disciplinarity”; and Gieryn, “Boundary-Work and the Demarcation of Science.”

8. Henry Grattan Doyle (1889–1964), from the Harvard class of 1911, studied with J. D. M. Ford and began teaching at the George Washington University in 1921, where he quickly became full professor of Romance languages and was later appointed Dean of Columbian College. An influential voice in American Hispanism and modern language teaching, he was a prominent figure in professional organizations like the AATS, the MLA, and the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers. He worked as the managing editor of the *Modern Language Journal* (1934–38) and editor of *Hispania* (1942–48). In these and other capacities, he was a lifelong advocate for rigor in language teaching and literary scholarship. In 1939, he was appointed chair of the newly founded MLA Commission on Trends in Education.

9. Doyle, “Foreign Politics in the Classroom,” 92.

10. It should be remembered that foreign language instruction was seen as threatened on several fronts. Doyle, as chairman of the Commission on Trends in Education instituted by the MLA in 1939, complained in a preliminary report that many American educational experts, even those in favor of internationalization, trivialized the importance of language learning. But, he added, the problem was more deep-seated: “We must frankly recognize, to begin with, that our countrymen, *in general*, don’t like foreigners or any of their works” (Doyle, “Some Fundamental Problems,” 1348–49). According to Elizabeth Wilson, the MLA Commission was created in part as a disciplinary defense against the rise of progressive education inspired by the theories of John Dewey (Wilson, “Short History of a Border War,” 62).

11. Doyle, “Foreign,” 93.

12. Havens, “Modern Language Teacher,” 307. Further page references will be parenthetical.

13. Doyle, “Foreign,” 94. Further references are parenthetical.

14. Rowell, “Relationship of the Various Freedoms,” quoted in Doyle, “Foreign,” 95–96. See also Flint, “Academic Freedom,” quoted in Cohen, *When the Old Left*, 104.

15. American Association of University Professors, “1940 Statement.”

16. Fish, “Why We Built the Ivory Tower.”

17. Fish, “Save the World on Your Own Time.”

18. *Ibid.*

19. Said, *Representations of the Intellectual*, xvi.

20. *Ibid.*, 88 (my emphasis).

21. Williams, “Romance of the Intellectual,” 64.

22. *Ibid.*, 56.

23. Needless to say, the academic Orientalist establishment, in turn, was quick to mobilize its scholarly expertise against the “amateur” Said. As Christopher de Bellaigue wrote in a review of Robert Irwin’s *For Lust of Knowing*, a study that largely dismisses Said’s critique of Orientalism, Said “somersaulted into Orientalism from a career in comparative literature” (Bellaigue, “Where Said Was Wrong”).

24. Adams, “Some Recent Novels,” 83–84.

25. Rey García, *Stars for Spain*; Guttman, *Wound in the Heart*; Taylor, *United States and the Spanish Civil War*.

26. See Tierney, *FDR and the Spanish Civil War*.

27. A handwritten list of 2,276 International Brigaders from the Soviet archives identifies some twenty American volunteers as “teachers.” Abraham Lincoln Brigade Archives, Tamiment Library, New York University, New York.
28. See *New York Times*, “15,000 Take Pledge to Work for Peace,” September 7, 1936.
29. *New York Times*, “Peace Parade Here in Spanish Section,” November 12, 1936.
30. *New York Times*, “Belloc Denounces Spanish Loyalists,” March 20, 1937.
31. Shotwell, “Spanish Bishops’ Letter.”
32. *New York Times*, “Lawyers Ask Help for Loyalist Spain,” March 13, 1938.
33. *Washington Post*, “Scientists Plead for U.S. to Lift Spain Embargo,” April 28, 1938.
34. *Washington Post*, “Democracy Lies with Franco, Says Dr. Code,” May 12, 1938.
35. See *New York Times*, “Urges Recognition of Franco Regime: Dr. J. F. Thorning Says Precedents Back Our Acceptance,” April 2, 1938. See Southworth, *Guernica! Guernica!*, 395.
36. Coester, Editorial, 467.
37. In this context, it is interesting to note that American scholars from other disciplines felt more at ease discussing the Spanish Civil War. Analyses started to appear as early as 1937 in journals such as the *Journal of Comparative Legislation and International Law*, the *Political Science Quarterly*, the *American Political Science Review*, and especially, *The American Journal of International Law*, which between 1937 and 1939 published almost twenty articles dealing with the issue.
38. Davies, “What Is Hispanic Studies?” 1.
39. Gieryn, “Boundary-Work.”
40. “Noticias literarias,” 43–47. My translation.
41. Klein, “American Association of Teachers of Spanish,” 1068.
42. Email to the author, November 13, 2003.
43. Email to the author, May 12, 2005. Espinosa’s son, also named Aurelio, had been studying in Spain since 1929, and was surprised by the outbreak of the war while doing field research in Burgos for the Centro de Estudios Históricos. He left Spain soon after to return to the United States. In 1941, Espinosa, Sr. wrote a note to Ramón Menéndez Pidal requesting his support for the election of his son as corresponding member of the Spanish Royal Academy, emphasizing his son’s support for Franco’s cause (Prada Samper, *Pájaro que canta el bien*, 54). As Prada Samper writes, this note should be seen as an attempt on Espinosa, Sr.’s part to pave the way for his son; it is unclear to what extent Aurelio, Jr. really shared his father’s fervently pro-Franco position (*ibid.*).
44. Cuthbertson, “Escaping from the Spanish Revolution,” 452. Further references will be parenthetical.
45. “The causes of the Spanish revolution cannot be discussed here,” the author remarks on the first page (451).
46. As Álvarez Junco and Shubert point out, the Civil War gave new life to romantic clichés about the Spaniards (Introduction, 8). See also Ucelay da Cal, “Ideas preconcebidas.”
47. Espinosa, *Second Spanish Republic*, 9. Further references are parenthetical.
48. For more information on Benardete’s life and work, see Langnas and Sholod, *Studies in Honor of M.J. Benardete*.
49. Of Sender’s *Siete domingos rojos*, Adams writes that it will help the reader “comprehend much better the proletariat’s deep dissatisfaction with things as they are, which, sufficiently intensified, must necessarily lead to rebellion and civil war” (Adams, “Some Recent Novels,” 82).
50. Reid, “Spain as Seen.”
51. Adams, “Some,” 84.

CHAPTER 4

1. Strictly speaking, this list should include Spanish linguistics, which grew as a separate specialization out of Spanish and Romance philology; here, however, I will leave the linguists out of the picture.
2. Arthur N. Applebee, *Tradition and Reform*, quoted in Graff, *Professing Literature*, 69.
3. Interestingly, thanks to the Cold War push for area studies, the Latin American field has been able to maintain more of an overarching interdisciplinary framework than its Peninsular counterpart. Critics of Spanish literature belong to the Modern Language Association (MLA); historians of Spain to the Society for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies (SSPHS) and the American Historical Association (AHA); but Latin Americanists meet and read each other through the Latin American Studies Association (LASA).
4. See Boyd, “Hispanismo norteamericano”; Casanova, “Narración, síntesis”; Eakin, “Latin American History”; Fernández, “Longfellow’s Law”; Klein, “American Association”; Kagan, “Prescott’s Paradigm” and *Spain in America*; Leavitt, “Teaching of Spanish”; Resina, “Cold War Hispanism”; Romera Navarro, *Hispanismo en Norteamérica*; Spell, “Spanish Teaching”; Stimson, “Beginning of American Hispanism,” “Present Status of Studies,” and *Orígenes del hispanismo norteamericano*; Ucelay da Cal, “Hispanic Studies ‘Ghetto’”; and Ullman, “Spanish History.”
5. Fernández, “Longfellow’s,” 54.
6. Spell, “Spanish Teaching,” 151–52.
7. Berger, *Under Northern Eyes*; Eakin.
8. Fernández, “Longfellow’s,” 53–54.
9. See Faber, “La hora ha llegado” and “Economies of Prestige.”
10. Faber, “Hora.”
11. Berger, *Under*, 35–36.
12. Berger, “Greater America,” 55.
13. Fagg, *Pan Americanism*, 52.
14. Berger, *Under*, 44.
15. “Twentieth Annual Meeting.”
16. At the December 1937 meeting, the AATS passed the resolution “that no scholar should be excluded because of race, religion, or politics from speaking before any learned society on a subject within the field of his professional competence” (“Twenty-First Annual Meeting,” 3).
17. *Ibid.*, 4–5 (my translation).
18. “Twenty-Second Annual Meeting,” 10–11. For Pattee’s defense of Franco, see Pattee, *This Is Spain*, and Southworth, *Mito de la Cruzada*, 157–58.
19. Hespelt, “Spanish in a Changing World,” 2–3.
20. Michael Richards and others calculate that the postwar repression in Francoist Spain caused 200,000 deaths (Richards, *Time of Silence*, 29). On prisons and concentration camps, see Molinero et al., *Inmensa Prisión*, and Rodrigo, *Campos de concentración*.
21. Colburn, “Twenty-Third Annual Meeting,” 2.
22. Quoted in Colburn, “Twenty-Third,” 4–5.
23. Colburn, “Twenty-Third,” 13–15.
24. Pike, *United States*, 272–81; Pike, *FDR’s Good Neighbor Policy*, 86–101.
25. As is well known, this “contamination” would justify the persecution during the Cold War of the “premature antifascists” who had rallied to the defense of the Spanish Republic.
26. A. Aguilar, *Pan Americanism*, 71–72.

27. Berger, *Under*, 48–49.
28. Pike, *United*, 287.
29. Howson, *Arms for Spain*, 164–65.
30. Brown, “Academic Spain Today,” 1.
31. Brown, “Actividades culturales,” 65; I quote from the same text published in English: Brown, “Culture Activities,” 6.
32. Manning, “Visit to Menéndez Pidal,” 520.
33. *Ibid.*, 521.
34. *Ibid.*
35. Menéndez Pidal and Manning, “Corrections,” 226.
36. *Ibid.*, 227.
37. When Menéndez Pidal left the country, he had left his library in his house, which was indeed placed under the protection of the British embassy. The house and the library survived the war unscathed. Before leaving, however, the philologist decided to deposit some of his materials—his *romancero* archive and his file cards referring to his project on the history of the Spanish language—in the Mexican embassy. When the embassy moved to Valencia, the Republican government declared Menéndez Pidal’s papers part of the National Treasury, storing them first in the National Library and later, via Barcelona, in Geneva, together with other objects of great cultural value, such as Velázquez’s *Meninas* (Amigos de El Olivar, “Etapa de 1936–1945”).
38. Sweeney, “Report on Spain,” 234.
39. *Ibid.*, 235.
40. Sacks, “Herbert Matthews Reports,” 423–24. Matthews’ book was also reviewed for *The Nation* by Joseph H. Silverman, then assistant professor of Spanish at the University of California, Los Angeles. This, too, was a first: not since the end of the Civil War had an academically affiliated Hispanist written on the topic of the war in the liberal American media (Silverman, “Three Windows on Spain”).
41. The filmmaker Luis Buñuel, accused of Communism, was forced out of his job at the Museum of Modern Art in New York, and moved to Mexico in the mid-1940s.
42. See, for instance, Schiffrrin, *Cold War and the University*; Simpson, *University and Empire*; Lowen, *Creating the Cold War University*; Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower*; Saunders, *Cultural Cold War*.
43. Among the exceptions are Resina, “Cold War” and Esenwein “Cold War and Anglo-American Historiography.”
44. As AATSP president Norman Sacks said as late as 1966, “Since a prestigious member of the club of liberal arts disciplines must not claim to be practical, must not be associated with commercial objectives, must base its cultural claim exclusively upon a European affiliation, and must glory in its difficulty, Spanish, as a liberal arts discipline, has appeared to be difficult to accept” (Sacks, “Making of a Hispanist” 28). See also Faber, “Economies.”
45. Ohmann, “English and the Cold War,” 79. Further references will be parenthetical.
46. Faber, “Contradictions of Left-Wing Hispanismo.”
47. Castro, *Meaning of Spanish Civilization*, 9. Further references will be parenthetical.
48. As I have shown elsewhere, for instance, in his only contribution to the *Revista Iberoamericana*, Castro chided the Mexicans for championing their country’s indigenous heritage over the Spanish legacy. Castro thought that Mexico would not find its much-needed “equilibrium” as long as it refused to acknowledge that it was Cortés who had saved it from a “bloody and inert existence” (Faber, “Hora,” 77). And, when Castro, in *La peculiaridad lingüística rioplatense* (1941) implied that the Spanish spoken in Argentina is “messy” (*un desbarajuste*), Jorge Luis Borges retorted that, in his travels through Spain, he has never noticed “que los españoles hablan mejor que nosotros.

(Hablan en voz más alta, eso sí, con el aplomo de quienes ignoran la duda.)” [that the Spaniards spoke better than we did. (They speak louder, that is true, with the conviction of those who do not know doubt)] (Borges, *Otras inquisiciones*, 45). Borges not only points out Castro’s lack of knowledge of Argentina, but also that Castro’s elevating of Castilian Spanish into a global pan-Hispanic linguistic norm is completely arbitrary.

49. The first version of this cultural history was published in 1948 in Buenos Aires, by Losada, as *España en su historia*. Later, revised and expanded versions were published in 1954 and 1962, by Porrúa in Mexico City, as *La realidad histórica de España*.
50. See, for instance, Goytisolo, “Ayer, hoy y mañana.”
51. Beverley, “Class or Caste,” 141, 147–48.
52. There were some important exceptions, such as José Rubia Barcia, aka “Andrés Aragón,” who came to the United States in 1943 after spending four years in Cuba. Ironically, it was Américo Castro who secured him a visiting position at Princeton; Rubia Barcia was a beginning Arabist, and Castro was interested in Oriental studies. Although, as a socialist militant, Rubia had great difficulties entering the United States, he was eventually allowed in. While at Princeton, he was hired by the Office of War Information (OWI) to be head of the Spanish News Desk, from where he gave weekly radio chats (as “Andrés Aragón”) for the antifascist Spanish resistance. He also wrote for the New York exile journal *España Libre*. Rubia left the OWI after he refused to translate and broadcast a speech by Churchill in which the British leader called Franco a “gentleman.” After moving to Los Angeles to work with Luis Buñuel, Rubia Barcia was arrested for illegal entry into the United States and threatened with deportation to Spain—which would have meant a certain death. He was released on a bond, but his immigration status was not resolved until ten years later. Meanwhile, he was called up to testify for the House Un-American Activities Committee. In 1955, he was arrested again, and it was not until his department chair at the University of Los Angeles, where he had been working, mobilized his political contacts (particularly, future President Lyndon Johnson), that the long-standing deportation order against Rubia Barcia was withdrawn. He became a U.S. citizen a year later. See Namias, *First Generation*, 99–109, and Johnson, “José Rubia Barcia.” Thanks to Eric Smith for the Namias reference.
53. Resina, “Cold War,” 72. Further references will be parenthetical.
54. Kagan, “Prescott’s,” 438–39.
55. Ullman, “Spanish”; Boyd, “Hispanismo.”
56. Ucelay Da Cal, “Hispanic”; Boyd, “Hispanismo,” 114.
57. The relative isolation of Peninsular studies—whether literary studies or historiography—stands in sharp contrast with the impressive rise of Latin American studies, which has, from the beginning, been much more in touch with mainstream academic trends. From the 1930s on, but especially during the Cold War, academic initiatives in Latin American studies received strong support from the U.S. government. Until the 1960s, U.S. Latin Americanists adopted a largely uncritical stance vis-à-vis U.S. policy toward Latin America; since then, though, it has become an important academic bastion of opposition. As a result, Latin Americanists—whether they are historians, anthropologists, literary critics, sociologists, or political scientists—have been markedly more politicized than Peninsular Hispanists. (See Berger, *Under*, for a comprehensive history of U.S. Latin American studies.)

CHAPTER 5

1. Southworth, “Escape at Teruel.”
2. Ibid.
3. For accounts of Southworth’s life, see Southworth, “A modo de prólogo,” Preston, Prologue to *Conspiracy and the Spanish Civil War*; and Preston, *Idealistas bajo las balas*, 419–36. Preston’s book is forthcoming in English as *We Saw Spain Die. Foreign Correspondents in the Spanish Civil War* (London: Constable-Robinson).
4. Ibid.
5. Southworth, “Spain in Tatters.”
6. Southworth, “Apology for Revolt.”
7. Southworth, “Their Eyes on the Past.”
8. Southworth, “Franco’s Friend” (*Washington Post*).
9. See Southworth, “Franco’s Friend” (*Nation*); “Catholic Press”; “Spanish Phalanx”; and Southworth and Espy, “Franco in the Caribbean.”
10. Jay Allen papers, ALBA archives, Tamiment Library, New York University, New York.
11. Preston, *Idealistas*, 427.
12. Preston, “War of Words,” 5.
13. Gabriel Jackson had finished his dissertation on “The Problem of Land Reform, the Church, and Education in Republican Spain, 1931–33” in 1950, but it took nine years before an article on the topic made it into the *American Historical Review*. Stanley Payne wrote his Claremont MA thesis on “José Antonio Primo de Rivera and the Beginning of Falange Española” in 1957, and published his book *Falange: A History of Spanish Fascism* four years later.
14. Preston, *Idealistas*, 421.
15. Preston, Prologue to *Conspiracy*, x.
16. Southworth, *Mito de la cruzada*, 7–8.
17. Ibid., 5. All translations from Southworth’s books, articles, and letters are mine, except for the Guernica book, for which I will quote from the English translation.
18. Preston, *Idealistas*, 430.
19. Southworth, *Antifalange*, 13.
20. Ibid., 15.
21. Carr, “Franco and the Falange,” 996.
22. Martínez to Southworth, November 18, 1978, Martínez Papers, IISH, Amsterdam. Paul Preston has concluded from the correspondence between Southworth and Jay Allen that Southworth had made a considerable monetary investment in José Martínez’s publishing venture to facilitate the production of *El mito*. Email message to the author, October 1, 2007; Preston, *Idealistas*, 429.
23. First presented in 1974 as a dissertation at the Sorbonne with the title *La destruction de Guernica, 26 avril 1937. Étude historique sur le journalisme, la diplomatie et la propagande*, the book was published in 1975 by Ruedo Ibérico, with a preface by the dissertation sponsor, Pierre Vilar, as *La destruction de Guernica: journalisme, diplomatie, propagande et histoire*. Spanish and English translations followed: *La destrucción de Guernica. Periodismo, diplomacia, propaganda e historia* (Paris: Ruedo Ibérico, 1977), and *Guernica, Guernica! A Study of Journalism, Diplomacy, Propaganda, and History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977).
24. Southworth, *Guernica*, 316.
25. Jackson, “Recordando a Herbert Southworth.”
26. Martínez to Southworth, November 18, 1978. All correspondence cited is from the Martínez Papers, IISH, Amsterdam.
27. Southworth to Martínez, December 3–4, 1978.

28. Southworth, *Conspiracy*, 1.
29. Preston, *Idealistas*, 434.
30. Like Hayden White, moreover, Southworth is quite aware of the fact that historiography obeys the laws and conventions of narrative. In his deconstruction of the Francoist myth of the Alcázar siege in Toledo, he argues that the official Francoist version—in which the captive son of a Nationalist commander is executed shortly after his father refuses to surrender in order to save his son's life—is not only untrue (in reality, the son was executed three weeks later, for a different reason) but suspiciously resonant of the plot of a famous episode from medieval Spanish history (Southworth, *Mito*, 53).
31. Vilar, Foreword, ix–x.
32. “The sad truth,” he writes, “is that this country, betrayed from 1936 to 1939 by all the countries in the world except for Mexico and the Soviet Union, was again betrayed in 1945 by those who had won the ‘war against Fascism’” (*Mito*, 159–60).
33. Southworth, *Mito*, 11.
34. *Ibid.*, 146.
35. Southworth, “Guernica,” Letter to Editor, 662–63.
36. In a review of a book by David Wingeate Pike on the French and the Spanish Civil War, Southworth complained that, while the material presented by Pike makes a damning case against the French press of the period, the author abstains from any denunciations. “Historians have the right and the obligation,” Southworth writes, “to judge the performance of the press as they judge statesmen and generals” (“War beyond the Pyrenees,” 326).
37. Matthews, *World in Revolution*, 39.
38. Styer, Comment.
39. Graff, *Professing Literature*, 62.
40. Southworth, *Mito*, 11. Subsequent references will be parenthetical.
41. Burnett Bolloten, *The Grand Camouflage: The Communist Conspiracy in the Spanish Civil War* (New York: Praeger, 1961); *El gran engaño* (Barcelona: Luis de Caralt, 1961). Later, revised and expanded versions of Bolloten’s work were published as *The Grand Camouflage: The Spanish Civil War and Revolution, 1936–39* (New York: Praeger, 1968); *The Spanish Revolution: The Left and the Struggle for Power during the Civil War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979); and *The Spanish Civil War: Revolution and Counterrevolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991).
42. Southworth, *Mito*, 148.
43. See Southworth, “Divisions of the Left”; Bolloten, *Spanish Revolution*; Southworth, “Spanish Civil War”; Bolloten “Spanish Civil War.”
44. Southworth, *Conspiracy*, 85. See also Southworth, “Grand Camouflage.”
45. Martínez Papers, IISH, Amsterdam.
46. Southworth to Martínez, February 15, 1971.
47. Southworth, “Bibliófobos,” 34, 19, 42.
48. Southworth to Martínez, August 1, 1971.
49. Southworth to Martínez, April 26, 1971.
50. Soutworth to Thomas A. Glick, December 8, 1971.
51. Southworth to Martínez, January 25, 1972.
52. Samaniego, “Todavía no se ha publicado.”
53. *Ibid.*
54. Southworth, *Guernica* 397.
55. Arroyo, “Southworth advierte”; Southworth, “Desde el rencor.”
56. Southworth, *Mito*, 172.
57. Southworth, “Desde el rencor.”

58. Preston, *Idealistas*, 428.
59. Southworth, “Desde el rencor.”
60. Martínez to Southworth, November 18, 1978 and January 8, 1979; Southworth to Martínez, December 3 and 4, 1978.
61. *El País*, “Una comisión hispano-alemán [sic] investigará el bombardeo de Guernica,” February 12, 1978.

CHAPTER 6

1. Rogers, “Spanish Journey,” 115.
2. Hughes, *I Wonder as I Wander*, 358.
3. Several foreign Hispanists were working or vacationing in Spain in July 1936, but once the war had started, most left as soon as they could. One famous exception was the Spaniard José Robles Pazos, a longtime friend of John Dos Passos who taught at Johns Hopkins, and who decided to stay in Spain and work for the Republic. His mysterious death caused a great deal of controversy. See Martínez del Pisón, *Enterrar a los muertos*; Koch, *Breaking Point*.
4. Jordan’s character was partly inspired by Robert Merriman, an economics instructor at the University of California who joined the International Brigades in Spain in 1937, and was killed in March of the next year.
5. In October 1936, Rogers had given a talk about “Spain Today” in which, according to a report in the *Oberlin Review*, he said that “the American Press has not been able to give an accurate picture of events in Spain.” *Oberlin Review*, “Rogers Lectures on ‘Spain Today,’” October 13, 1936, 3.
6. I am indebted to Professor Douglass Rogers for this detailed information on his father’s family background.
7. Douglass Rogers, letter to the author, October 13, 2003.
8. Douglass Rogers, “Paul Patrick Rogers.”
9. *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, “90 from 69 Groups Join Against Fascism,” January 28, 1935; “U.S. Must Avert War,” April 9, 1935; and “Asks 3 Theaters to Halt Hearst Films,” October 5, 1935.
10. Douglass Rogers, letter to the author, October 18, 2007.
11. Rogers, “Tom Johnson’s Town,” 23.
12. Douglass Rogers, letter to the author, July 22, 2006.
13. The League had been founded in the fall of 1933 in New York at the First U.S. Congress Against War, at the urging of the French author Henri Barbusse, who represented the World Committee Against War and Fascism, which, in turn, had come out of the World Congress Against War in Amsterdam in 1932. Later in the 1930s, the League was identified as a front organization of the American Communist Party (Ottanelli, *Communist Party*, 173–74).
14. Rogers, “García Lorca.” A letter from León Felipe to Rogers from the Fall of 1932 indicates that Rogers traveled to Spain during that year (León Felipe to Rogers, November 1932; Rogers Papers 1.2, Harry Ransom Center, Austin, Texas). In November 1933, the *Oberlin Review* reported on a talk on Spain by Rogers, “who has recently visited that country,” in which the professor argued that “Republican Spain is eventually traveling the road to Communism” (*Oberlin Review*, “Professor Rogers Analyses Spain’s Domestic Problems,” November 3, 1933).
15. Rogers, “Spanish Influence on the Literature of France.”
16. Rogers, “Culture of Spain,” 25–26; Rogers FBI file, no. 100-263307-22, 3.

17. Rogers' Spanish diary is at the Harry Ransom Center in Austin; I am indebted to Professor Douglass Rogers for making sections of the Paris diary available to me.
18. Rogers to Wilkins, January 7, 1937. E. H. Wilkins File, Correspondence Rogers L.-Rogers P.P., Oberlin College Archives.
19. Rogers, "Republican Posters," 21.
20. *Ibid.*
21. Taylor, *United States and the Spanish Civil War*, 101.
22. Rogers, Diary, June 8–August 7, 1937, 50.
23. After waiting in vain for visa approval from the U.S. State Department, Rogers finally secured a visa through the French Interior Minister, skipping official American approval altogether.
24. Rogers, "Spanish Journey," 94. Subsequent references will be parenthetical.
25. "E. A. Q: Radio Speech August 13, 1937." Paul Patrick Rogers Papers 1.7, Harry Ransom Center, Austin, Texas. Rogers was not able to read this speech himself because he was leaving Madrid for a trip to Albacete; in his place, his friend Leo Gallagher read it into the microphone on August 13 or 14 (Rogers, "Spanish Journey," 134–35).
26. When the Spanish Tourist Bureau keeps referring him to other people for a travel permit, he remarks: "Very Spanish . . . let someone else do the job"; "No wonder Spain's undisciplined masses were unable to cope with the well trained forces of Hitler and Mussolini during early days of struggle. The discipline demanded by the C. P. was their only salvation" (Rogers, "Spanish Journey," 31–32).
27. Rogers, "Culture," 25.
28. *Ibid.*
29. Douglass Rogers, letter to the author, July 22, 2006.
30. Rogers, Diary, 2.
31. While in Paris, he considers proposing to the North American Committee the idea of organizing "exhibitions of antifascist documents and pictures in large cities all over U.S." (Rogers, Diary, June 8–August 7, 1937, 27, 32).
32. Blodgett, "Campus Life at Oberlin."
33. *Ibid.*
34. Eagan, *Class, Culture, and the Classroom*; Cohen, *When the Old Left Was Young*.
35. The "Oxford Pledge" was named after the 1933 resolution adopted by the Oxford Union stating that the University's students would not "fight for King and country." Other British universities soon followed. In the United States, too, students adopted resolutions declaring their refusal "to support the United States government in any war it may conduct."
36. Cohen, *When*, 154–87.
37. *Ibid.*, 173.
38. *Oberlin Review*, "Rogers Lectures on 'Spain Today,'" October 13, 1936, 3.
39. *Oberlin Review*, "ASU Would Help Spain," December 4, 1936, 1.
40. *Oberlin Review*, "Dean Wittke Suggests Aiding Both Armies in Spanish Conflict," January 14, 1938, 1; Carl Wittke, Letter to the editor, *Oberlin Review*, January 18, 1938, 2; *Oberlin Review*, "ASU Will Assist Young Loyalists," January 18, 1938, 4.
41. *Oberlin Review*, "MacEachron Captured by Insurgents," March 25, 1938, 1.
42. According to a short biographical note on MacEachron compiled by Carl Geiser, MacEachron had been captured by Italian soldiers, who had turned him over to a Spanish unit that shot him (Abraham Lincoln Brigade Archives, Vertical Files "MacEachron, Paul Norton," Tamiment Library, New York University).
43. *Oberlin Review*, "Dies Starts Local 'Red' Probe," November 29, 1938, 1.
44. Sagalyn, "Red Menace."
45. *Oberlin Review*, "Dies Starts Local 'Red' Probe," November 29, 1938, 1.

46. *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, “Asks Gypsy Rose to Tell of Reds,” November 25, 1938.
47. “The Dies Committee was the first congressional committee to take full advantage of its power to punish with subpoenas and contempt citations, and its ability to harm through insinuation and publicity,” Ted Morgan writes. “A subpoena was a scary thing, a dark and inescapable stigma. A contempt citation could result in a jail sentence, and taking the Fifth Amendment could lead swiftly to unemployment. Dies pioneered the issue of Communists in government, using it to undermine the New Deal” (Morgan, *Reds*, 188).
48. *Oberlin Review*, “Spanish Club to Hear Rogers on October 29,” October 19, 1937, 1; *Oberlin Review*, “Library Exhibit Points to Spain,” March 8, 1938, 1.
49. Morgan, *Reds*, 184–85.
50. Rogers’ name does turn up in several of the Dies Committee hearings in relation to the American League Against War and Fascism, later renamed as the American League for Peace and Democracy. He is listed among the members of the 1939 National Committee, the 1938 Program Committee, and the 1936 National Executive Board. See *Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities in the United States. Hearings before a Special Committee on Un-American Activities*. Seventy-sixth Congress. First Session on H. Res. 282. Vol. 10, 6278; Seventy-fifth Congress. Third Session on H. Res 282. Vol. 1, 470; vol. 2, 1594.
51. Rogers, “Galdós Suggested a League of Nations.”
52. Rogers, “New Facts on Bécquer’s *Historia*.”
53. Rogers, “Grub Street in Spain.”
54. Burnshaw, 192. Rogers to León Felipe, April 29, 1966, Rogers Papers, Harry Ransom Center, Austin, Texas.
55. *Escritores contemporáneos de México* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1949); *Florilegio de cuentos españoles* (New York: Macmillan, 1961).
56. Paul P. Rogers and Felipe-Antonio Lapuente, *Diccionario de seudónimos literarios españoles, con algunas iniciales* (Madrid: Gredos, 1977).
57. Douglass Rogers, letter to the author, July 22, 2006.
58. Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower*, 43.
59. The distinguished American historian Richard N. Current, Oberlin alumnus of ’34, recalls about Rogers that “in class, he sometimes talked about the oppressiveness of capitalism when I would rather have been hearing about the language and literature of Spain” (email message to the author, August 18, 2003). Victor Stone, class of ’42, recalls how, as a student of Rogers’ in Spanish 101, he once inquired about the meaning of the Civil War slogan *No pasarán!* The rest of the class was taken up by Rogers’ passionate response (conversation with the author, May 2006).
60. Rogers to unknown friend, March 3, 1944. Paul Patrick Rogers. Federal Bureau of Investigation, file no. 100-263307-17. My translation from the Spanish.
61. Cohen, *When*, 278–321.
62. *Ibid.*, 331.
63. Rogers FBI file, no. 100-263307-22.
64. Rogers had been in Mexico before; his correspondence with León Felipe makes reference to a trip in the summer of 1931 (León Felipe to Rogers, October 20, 1931. P. P. Rogers papers 1.2, Harry Ransom Center, Austin, Texas).
65. According to his FBI file, Rogers spent the whole fall of 1942 in Mexico, as well as the summers of 1944, 1945, and 1947; the spring and summer of 1950; the summers of 1952 and 1953; a week in 1954; and the summer of 1961.
66. Anhalt, *Gathering of Fugitives*; Schreiber, “Cold War Culture.”
67. Douglass Rogers, letter to the author, July 22, 2006.
68. Rogers, *Spanish for the First Year*, 4. Subsequent references will be parenthetical.

69. Rogers destroyed almost all of his correspondence before his death. Among his own papers at the Harry Ransom Center, the León Felipe letters are among the few that have been preserved. His letters to Stanley Burnshaw are, in fact, part of the Burnshaw papers.
70. Rogers to Burnshaw, June 27, 1970. Stanley Burnshaw Papers 2-7, Harry Ransom Center, Austin, Texas.
71. Rogers, "Republican Posters," 21-22.
72. Rogers, "Spanish Civil War," 95.
73. Rogers, "Republican Posters," 23.

CHAPTER 7

1. Smith, E., "New York's Aid"; Ottanelli, "New York City Left"; Fernández, "Nueva York."
2. The *Commonweal* had been organizing the event; when the *Commonweal* fund merged with the American Committee, the Committee took over the organization (*New York Times*, "Two Drives Pressed for Relief in Spain," May 6, 1937, 5; Darrow, 87).
3. Tusell and García Queipo de Llano, *Catolicismo mundial*, 321.
4. *The Nation*, "The Shape of Things," Editorial, October 3, 1936, 379. Quoted in Darrow, 88.
5. "American Committee for Spanish Relief," *Commonweal*, May 14, 1937, 143.
6. "For Spanish Relief," *Commonweal*, May 28, 1937, 129.
7. *New York Times*, "Two Drives Pressed for Relief in Spain," May 6, 1937, 5; *New York Times*, "3 Years' Conflict Feared for Spain," May 12, 1937, 18.
8. *New York Times*, "Bias on Spain Denied by New Relief Group," April 11, 1937, 34; *New York Times*, "War Aid is Linked to Franco's Cause," May 5, 1937, 17; *New York Times*, "Spain Group Here Bars Partisanship," May 18, 1937, 15.
9. Rey García, *Stars for Spain*, 67.
10. Peers, *Redbrick University Revisited*, 166, 320.
11. *New York Herald Tribune*, "15,000 Attend Spanish Relief Garden Session," May 20, 1937.
12. *Ibid.*
13. Curran's pamphlets include *Spain in Arms: With Notes on Communism* (1936) and *Franco: Who is He, What Does He Fight For?* (1937).
14. Norwood, "Marauding Youth and the Christian Front," 240; McNamara, "Pro-Franco Sentiment and Activity," 97.
15. Darrow, "Catholic Political Power," 89.
16. *Ibid.*
17. Williams, "Spain's Sacrifice," 71-72.
18. "American Committee for Spanish Relief," *Commonweal*, May 14, 1937, 143.
19. *New York Herald Tribune*, "15,000 Attend Spanish Relief Garden Session," May 20, 1937.
20. *New York Times*, "15,000 At Rally Aid a Fund For Spain," May 20, 1937, 8.
21. *New York Times*, "Mass of Spaniards Called Rightists," May 14, 1937, 8.
22. *New York Times*, "3 Years' Conflict Feared for Spain," May 12, 1937, 18.
23. "American Committee for Spanish Relief," *Commonweal*, June 4, 1937, 143; Rey García, *Stars*, 68; *New York Times*, "Aid for Spain Cut by High Expenses," September 4, 1937, 4.
24. Williams, "The Truth about Spain [4]," 152.

25. The great majority of the British and American Catholic press quickly sided with Franco. See Tusell and García Queipo de Llano, *Catolicismo*, 241–364.
26. Tusell and García Queipo de Llano, *Catolicismo*, 260, 332–43.
27. Peers, “Spain That Had No Easter,” 39–40.
28. Peers, *Redbrick University Revisited*, 75.
29. *Ibid.*, 85.
30. *Ibid.*, 116.
31. *Ibid.*, 114–15.
32. An influential group of professors, including Peers’ predecessor James Fitzmaurice-Kelly, were strongly opposed to Peers’ candidacy. See Peers, *Redbrick University Revisited*.
33. Peers, *Redbrick University Revisited*, 126.
34. In 1918, he founded the Humanities Research Association.
35. Hart, “From Schizoidism to Big Bang,” 654–55.
36. Ribbans, “E. Allison Peers,” 26–27.
37. Brenan, “Some Spanish Poets,” 68.
38. Ribbans, “Peers,” 29.
39. Greene and Flint describe how British Catholics, generally liberal in outlook, received the Republic with cautious optimism, but saw themselves forced to side with Franco in response to the anticlerical violence on the Loyalist side. Their identification with the Nationalists then led them to tolerate or, in some cases, even embrace, totalitarian solutions for Spain. Greene, “English Catholic Press”; Flint, “Must God Go Fascist?”; Tusell and García Queipo de Llano, *Catolicismo*, 241–96.
40. Tusell and García Queipo de Llano, *Catolicismo*, 241–364.
41. Peers, *Redbrick University Revisited*, 166, 320.
42. Peers, *Spanish Tragedy*, sixth ed., 240.
43. Greene, “English.”
44. Peers, “Constitution for Spain.”
45. Peers, “Uncertainty in Spain.”
46. Peers, “Pendulum over Spain”; “Crisis in Spain,” 506.
47. Peers, *Spanish Tragedy*, 136. Subsequent references will be parenthetical.
48. One of the reasons Peers is enchanted with the Catalans is because of their “discipline,” “patience,” “moderation,” and “admirable restraint” (*Spanish Tragedy*, 103–6).
49. Peers, *Spanish Tragedy*, 144, 164, 62, 60; my emphasis throughout.
50. Peers, “Uncertainty.”
51. Peers, “Besieged City.”
52. Peers, “Religious Situation in Spain,” 361.
53. Peers, *Spanish Tragedy*, x.
54. Peers, “Pendulum,” 277.
55. *Ibid.*, 277, 280.
56. Peers, “War of All the Spains,” 626.
57. Peers, “Franco’s Victory Draws Nearer.”
58. *Hull Daily Mail*, “Spain—3 More Years of Conflict?” January 20, 1937. Peers Papers, Liverpool University, Liverpool.
59. Peers, *Spanish Tragedy*, 6th ed., 246–47.
60. Peers, “The Spanish Civil War: Causes, Responsibility and Conduct,” Peers Papers, Liverpool University.
61. Peers, “General Franco’s New Spain,” 222.
62. *Ibid.*, 225–26.
63. Peers, “Catalonia in the Civil War. II,” 650–51.
64. *Ibid.*, 651.

65. Riquer i Permanyer, *L'últim Cambó*, 123, 129–32.
66. Moradiellos cites a note to Burgos from the Duke of Alba, Franco's unofficial representative in London during the war, from October 1938, which identifies Peers as a Nationalist supporter (Moradiellos, "Espejo distante," 8).
67. Ramos Oliveira to Peers, November 29, 1937, Peers Papers, Box XXI, Liverpool University.
68. Meyer, Review, 379. See also Leonard, Review, 384.
69. Peers, "Religion in Spain," 12.
70. Peers, "Third Republic." See also Michael de la Bedoyere, editor of the *Catholic Herald*, to Peers, August 4, 1942. Peers Papers, Liverpool University, Box XXII.
71. Peers to Charles Duff, October 2, 1942. Peers Papers, Liverpool University.
72. Peers, "Evolution of the New Spain," 2.
73. *Ibid.*, 3.
74. Peers, "Two Hundred Years," 282.
75. Peers, *Church in Spain*, 13.
76. *Ibid.*, 2–3.
77. Peers, *Our Debt to Spain*, xii–xiii.
78. *Ibid.*, xiii–xiv.
79. Tusell and García Queipo de Llano, for instance, label him "a notorious propagandist of Franco's cause" (*Catolicismo*, 321); Rey García calls him a "pro-Franco historian" (*Stars*, 68).
80. See, for instance, Balfour, "Hispanismo británico," 169; Moradiellos, "Espejo," 8.
81. Peers, "Manuel Azaña."
82. Atkinson, "Why Learn Spanish?" 74–75.
83. Peers, *Royal Seville*, 75.
84. *Ibid.*, 94.
85. *Ibid.*, 59–60.
86. Read, "Travelling," 199.
87. Leonard, Review, 384–85.
88. Peers, *Spanish Tragedy*, 97–99.
89. Read, *Educating the Educators*, 33.
90. *Ibid.*, 37.
91. Peers, *Red Brick University*, quoted in Read, *Educating*, 53.
92. Tusell and García Queipo de Llano, *Catolicismo*, 247. My translation.
93. *Ibid.*
94. Peers, "Spain Revisited," 608.
95. *Ibid.*, 609.
96. *Ibid.*, 615.
97. Peers, "Reconstruction in Spain," 219.
98. Peers, "Spain Week by Week," *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* 18, no. 3 (1941): 150.
99. Peers, *Spanish Dilemma*, 99.
100. *Birmingham Post*, "France and Spain," July 13, 1942.
101. Peers, *Spain in Eclipse*, 177–78.
102. *Ibid.*, 168.
103. Moradiellos, "Gentle General."
104. Ribbons, "Peers," 25.
105. Wardroppe, Review, 560–62.
106. Peers, "Majorca Revisited," 386.
107. Peers, Letter to the editor, *London Times*, November 26, 1951, 5.
108. Ribbons, "Peers," 31.

CHAPTER 8

1. Gathorne-Hardy, *Interior Castle*, 302.
2. “An Eyewitness in Southern Spain: Warfare of the Middle Ages,” *Manchester Guardian Weekly*, August 14, 1936, 131; also in *Manchester Guardian*, August 12, 1936.
3. Bertrand Russell, “The Spanish Conspiracy,” letter to the editor, *New Statesman and Nation*, August 15, 1936, 218; also published as “Spain’s Civil War,” letter to the editor, *Manchester Guardian*, August 12, 1936, 18, and *Manchester Guardian Weekly*, August 14, 1936. Reprinted in *Yours Faithfully, Bertrand Russell: A Lifelong Fight for Peace, Justice, and Truth in Letters to the Editor*, ed. Ray Perkins Jr. (Chicago: Open Court, 2002), 111–12. Serendipitously, in the edition of the *Manchester Guardian Weekly*, Russell’s letter to the editor also appeared side by side with Brenan’s first report as a correspondent.
4. George Beaton, “Atrocities in Spain,” Letter to the Editor, *New Statesman and Nation*, August 15, 1936, 218.
5. Brenan, *Personal Record*, 299.
6. Buchanan, *Impact of the Spanish Civil War*, 23–42; Preston, *Idealistas bajo las balas*.
7. “An Eyewitness in Southern Spain: Warfare of the Middle Ages,” *Manchester Guardian Weekly*, August 14, 1936, 131 (also in *Manchester Guardian*, August 12, 1936).
8. *Ibid.*
9. *Ibid.*
10. *Ibid.*
11. Gathorne-Hardy, *Interior Castle*, 294.
12. Brenan, *Personal Record*, 306.
13. Gathorne-Hardy, *Interior Castle*, 131.
14. *Ibid.*, 350.
15. *Ibid.*, 316.
16. *Ibid.*, 322.
17. *Ibid.*, 337.
18. Moradiellos, “Más allá de la Leyenda Negra,” 185–89.
19. *Ibid.*, 189; Álvarez Junco and Shubert, Introduction, 8; Ucelay da Cay, “Ideas preconcebidas”; Cenarro Lagunas, “Tradición y renovación,” 68.
20. *Ibid.*
21. Trend, “Serious Study of Spain,” 296.
22. Bates, “Real Spain,” 270.
23. Gathorne-Hardy, *Interior Castle*, 344.
24. Peers, “Spanish Labyrinth,” 341.
25. Jackson, “Homenaje a Gerald Brenan,” 158–59.
26. Brenan, *Spanish Labyrinth*, xv. Subsequent references will be parenthetical.
27. Moradiellos, “Más allá,” 190.
28. Buchanan, *Impact*, 4–5; Moradiellos, “Más allá,” 189; Shubert and Álvarez Junco, Introduction, 8; Ucelay da Cal, “Ideas preconcebidas.”
29. Gathorne-Hardy, *Interior Castle*, 347–48; Carr, Foreword, viii, xi.
30. Gathorne-Hardy, *Interior Castle*, 348.
31. *Ibid.*, 346.
32. Brenan, *South of Granada*, 1.
33. *Ibid.*, xii.
34. Gibson, “Gerald Brenan,” 177.
35. Gathorne-Hardy, *Interior Castle*, 292; Carr, *Richard Ford, Gerald Brenan*, 15.
36. Gathorne-Hardy, *Interior Castle*, 345.

37. Carr, Foreword, ix.
38. Ibid., x.
39. Brenan, “Tortured Spain,” 46.
40. Brenan, *Best of Friends*, 134.
41. Moradiellos cites a report Brenan sent to the Foreign Office in October 1938, arguing that Spain and Britain would be best served by a victory of the Republic or a mediated peace (Moradiellos, “Espejo distante,” 27).
42. Dunthorn, *Britain and the Spanish Anti-Franco Opposition*, 56.
43. Gathorne-Hardy, *Interior Castle*, 536.
44. Brenan, “Spain in the Doldrums,” 5.
45. Brenan, “Spain and Its Future,” 453.
46. Brenan, “Spain.” Letter to the Editor, *New Statesman and Nation*, 395.
47. Brenan, “Spanish Scene,” 15.
48. “Literatures of Spain,” review of *The Literature of the Spanish People*, by Gerald Brenan, *Times Educational Supplement*, October 19, 1951, 806. The review is anonymous, but Gathorne-Hardy identifies Peers as the author.
49. Trend, “Spanish Literature,” 896.
50. Brenan, *Literature of the Spanish People*. Further references are parenthetical.
51. Brenan, *Best*, 164.
52. Gathorne-Hardy, *Interior Castle*, 374–75.
53. Brenan, *Best*, 159. Gathorne-Hardy, *Interior Castle*, 377n.
54. Ruiz Más, “*The Face of Spain*,” 165.
55. Gathorne-Hardy, *Interior Castle*, 390n.
56. Brenan, *Best*, 158.
57. Frank, “Our Crime against Spain,” 20.
58. Brenan, *Face of Spain* (New York: 1951), 199. Further reference to this first American edition will be given parenthetically in the text. Quotes from the preface (in Roman numerals), which was largely omitted from the American edition, are from the first British edition (Turnstile, 1950).
59. Buchanan, *Impact*, 163.
60. Brenan subtly distances himself from his pro-Republican commitment, writing: “I had—with some mental reserves—sympathized with the Republican cause and had written a book of a social-historical sort on the events that led up to the military rising. Later, during the European war, I had broadcast to Spain in a somewhat belligerent fashion” (*Face*, 72).
61. Comments on the Spanish *Volksgeist* occur throughout (*Face*, 56, 170, 175, 254–55, 262, 295).
62. Buchanan, *Impact*, 155.
63. Ibid., 160.
64. Pritchett, *Spanish Temper*, vii, quoted in Buchanan, *Impact*, 164.
65. Buchanan, *Impact*, 159–60.
66. Gathorne-Hardy, *Interior Castle*, 388.
67. Brenan, *Best*, 159.
68. According to Gibson, Brenan’s remigration was made possible by the “friendly intervention of Franco’s ambassador in London, Miguel Primo de Rivera, who acknowledges not to have read *The Spanish Labyrinth*, but who claims to know that in it Brenan speaks well of his brother José Antonio, as well as his father the *Dictador*” (Gibson, “Gerald Brenan,” 177–78).
69. Brenan, “Literary Letter from Madrid”; “Literary Letter from Spain.”
70. Gathorne-Hardy, *Interior Castle*, 402.

71. An exception to this last point was a review of Américo Castro's monumental *Structure of Spanish History*, published in *Encounter* in 1955, in which Brenan, reacting to Castro's metaphysical notion of Spanish character as determined by the medieval *convivencia* of Christians, Jews, and Moslems, once more emphasizes the impact on the Spanish style of life of "climate and geography" ("Spanish Predicament," 73).
72. Brenan, "Tortured," 43.
73. Ibid., 45–46. Brenan was not the only one to question the "liberal" view of Franco's Spain; see Borkenau, "How Deal with Franco?"
74. Gathorne-Hardy, *Interior Castle*, 402.
75. Ibid., 479.
76. Ibid., 412.
77. Brenan, "Spain Yesterday," 2.
78. Brenan, *South from Granada*, xiv. Subsequent references to this book will be parenthetical.
79. In *South from Granada*, for instance, he relativizes the importance of literacy and knowledge generally (65).
80. Gathorne-Hardy, *Interior Castle*, 395.
81. Wigg.
82. Carr, Foreword, vii.
83. Gathorne-Hardy, *Interior Castle*, 552.
84. Ibid., 561.
85. Markham, "Young in Spain Adopt 'El Ingles,'" 59.

CHAPTER 9

1. Jordan, *British Hispanism and the Challenge of Literary Theory*, 76, 79, 86.
2. Ibid., 74.
3. Ibid., 75.
4. Smith, P. J., *Writing in the Margin*, 202–5.
5. See Read, "Writing in the Institution"; "Travelling South"; *Language, Text, Subject; Educating the Educators*.
6. Read, "Travelling," 198–99.
7. Ibid., 203; Mariscal, "Introduction to the Ideology of Hispanism," 9.
8. Mariscal, "Introduction," 8.
9. Beasley-Murray, Review, 192.
10. Read, *Educating*, 1.
11. Ibid., 28.
12. Hart, "From Schizoidism to Big Bang," 655.
13. Jordan, *British Hispanism*, 77–80. See also Mariscal, "Introduction," 9–11.
14. Jordan, *British Hispanism*, 75.
15. Round, "Politics of Hispanism Reconstrued," 134.
16. Ibid., 136.
17. Ribbans, "E. Allison Peers," 31.
18. Round, "Politics," 141.
19. Mariscal, "Introduction," 11.
20. Pastor, *Breve historia del hispanismo inglés*; Metford, *British Contributions to Spanish and Spanish-American Studies*.
21. McKegney, "Progress of Latin American Studies," 317–20; San Román, "Rise of Modern Latin American Studies," 449–51.

22. San Román, “Rise,” 477.
23. Ibid., 459–61, 482–87.
24. Casanova, “Narración, síntesis y primado de la política,” 241.
25. Peers, *Redbrick University Revisited*, 143–44, 155.
26. Morley, “William James Entwistle,” 186.
27. Buchanan, *Impact of the Spanish Civil War*, 13; Cunningham, *Spanish Front*, xxii–xxv.
28. Dennis, Prologue, 9.
29. Trend, *Picture of Spain*, 7; quoted in Dennis, Prologue, 13.
30. Cenarro Lagunas, “Tradición y renovación,” 69.
31. Moradiellos, “Espejo distante,” 9; Azcárate, *Mi embajada en Londres*, 52–53.
32. Dennis, Prologue, 21.
33. Alpert, *New International History of the Spanish Civil War*, 64; *London Times*, “Intervention in Spain,” October 5, 1936.
34. Dennis, Prologue, 22.
35. Trend, *Mexico*, 2. Dennis suggests Trend might have gone to Valencia to attend the Second International Writers Congress on the Defense of Culture (Prologue, 21). Pablo de Azcárate, the Republican ambassador in London, mentions a visit he made in the company of Trend to Madrid and Valencia in August 1937 (*Mi embajada*, 116).
36. Dennis, Prologue, 22.
37. Trend, *Mexico*, 4.
38. Entwistle, “Background to the Spanish Civil War,” 91.
39. See Read, “Travelling” and “How’s Tricks” for an analysis of Entwistle’s ideological attachment to British imperialism.
40. Entwistle, “Background,” 91.
41. Ribbans, “Peers,” 25.
42. Grant, “Professor John Brande Trend,” 595.
43. In an article on the activities of British Hispanists during World War II, Entwistle referred to “a recent visit to Madrid” (Entwistle, “British Hispanism during the War,” 47).
44. Entwistle, “British Hispanism,” 48. A friend writing to the *London Times* in response to the publication of Entwistle’s obituary in 1952 remarked rather vaguely: “There is no doubt that events in Spain after 1936 disgusted him” (*London Times*, “Prof. W. J. Entwistle. Hispanic Philology,” June 27, 1952.)
45. See Marias’ *Todas las almas* (1989), *Negra espalda del tiempo* (1998), and his trilogy *Tu rostro mañana* (2002, 2004, 2007).
46. Michael, “Sir Peter Russell,” 1135.
47. Quoted in Jackson, *British Women and the Spanish Civil War*, 45.
48. Grant, “From a Spanish Diary,” 180–87. See also Jackson, *British Women*, 115–18, 223–24.
49. McKendrick, “Helen Grant,” 351.
50. Nigel Dennis, email message to author, October 16, 2007.
51. Grant, “Rica Brown,” 186. Incidentally, Brown spent a year teaching at Oberlin College in 1940–41, where she coincided with Paul Rogers.
52. Atkinson, *Spain*, 180–81.
53. Atkinson, “Civil War and After,” 420–21.
54. Moradiellos quotes from an October 1938 dispatch sent by the Duke of Alba, Franco’s semi-official representative in London, in which the Duke identifies Atkinson as “favorable a nuestra Causa, pero no se atreve a exteriorizarlo por temor a la reacción que ello pudiera producir entre los estudiantes de su Universidad” (in Moradiellos, “Espejo distante,” 9n).

55. *Records of British Foreign Office and MI5 Intelligence Gathering and Surveillance of Spanish Individuals, 1936–1945*. University of California at San Diego, Special Collections.
56. Atkinson, “Inquest on the Spanish Civil War,” 678.
57. Madariaga, Salvador de, et al. “Arrests in Spain,” letter to the editor, *London Times*, January 1, 1959.
58. Parker, “Victory and Defeat,” 328.
59. *Ibid.*, 533.
60. Parker, “The Spanish Republic,” 331.
61. *Ibid.*
62. *Ibid.*, 339.
63. *Ibid.*, 339–40.
64. *Ibid.*, 341.
65. Parker, “Spain’s Catholic Awakening,” 140.
66. Parker, “The Struggle in Spain—I.”
67. Parker, “Carlism in the Spanish Civil War,” 391.
68. Parker, *Catholic Church in Spain*, 40.
69. Parker, “Introduction to Spanish Culture,” 126–27.
70. *Ibid.*, 133.
71. *Ibid.*, 134.
72. Mackenzie, “Publications of A. A. Parker.”
73. Parker, “Carlism in the Spanish Civil War,” 398
74. Mariscal, “Introduction,” 12.
75. Parker, “Cervantes Centenary,” 198–99.
76. Parker, “Spanish Civilization,” 356.
77. Parker, *Valor actual del humanismo español*, 13.
78. *Ibid.*, 36–37.
79. Parker, “Roots of the Spanish Dilemma,” 453. Further references will be parenthetical.
80. Smith, *Writing*.
81. Balfour, “Hispanismo,” 167; Moradiellos, “Más allá,” 183.
82. Cenarro Lagunas, “Tradición,” 74–75; Balfour, “Hispanismo,” 164–65.
83. Preston, “War of Words,” 2.
84. Balfour, “Hispanismo,” 175, 179.
85. Deas, “Raymond Carr,” 1.
86. *Ibid.*, 4–5.
87. Preston and Lannon, Preface, v.
88. Carr, Introduction, 1.
89. Juliá, “Raymond Carr.” See also Elliott, “Insiders and Outsiders,” 119.
90. Deas, “Carr,” 2.
91. Balfour, 175, 179.
92. Preston, “War of Words,” 6. See also Balfour, “Hispanismo,” 173.
93. Southworth, *Lavado de cerebro*, 91–92. See also Chapter 5 of this book.
94. *Ibid.*, 94–97.
95. De la Cierva contributed an essay to *The Republic and the Civil War in Spain* (1971), edited by Carr. See Blinkhorn, “Anglo-American Historians.”
96. See Moradiellos, “Espejo”; Casanova, “Narración,” 245; Cenarro Lagunas, “Tradición,” 74–86; Guerrero de la Torre and Mateos, “Algunas notas sobre el hispanismo británico.”
97. Doubleday, “English Hispanists and the Discourse of Empiricism,” 205.
98. Elliott, “Hispanismo británico,” 80 (my translation).
99. Elliott, “Insiders,” 124.

100. Doubleday, “English Hispanists,” 208.
101. Ibid., 208–9.
102. Elliott, “Hispanismo,” 79 (my translation).
103. Elliott, “Galería,” 77–78 (my translation).
104. Cenarro Lagunas, “Tradición,” 99.
105. Preston, *Spanish Civil War* (2007), xviii.

CHAPTER 10

1. Preston, “War of Words.”
2. Some twenty years ago, in 1986, Preston wrote that the war had “generated over fifteen thousand books” (Preston, *Spanish Civil War* [1986], 3).
3. As George Esenwein has argued, judgments in this respect reflect the evolution of the Cold War and the consequent loyalty shifts among scholars and intellectuals (Esenwein, “Cold War and Anglo-American Historiography”).
4. See Chapter 5 in this book and P. Aguilar, *Memory and Amnesia*.
5. Cenarro Lagunas, “Tradición y renovación,” 95.
6. Fernández, “Longfellow’s Law.”
7. Kagan, “Prescott’s Paradigm.”
8. See Chapter 2 in this book.
9. Resina, “Cold War Hispanism,” 73.
10. Jackson, “Recordando a Herbert Southworth.”
11. Payne, Reviews of *Mythe* and *Antifalange*.
12. *Boletín de Orientación Bibliográfica* 35–36 (1965): 9–16.
13. Vidal, “Opositor americano de Franco” (my translation).
14. Thomas, “Heinkels over Guernica,” 392.
15. Southworth, “Guernica.”
16. Southworth, “A modo de prólogo,” 22.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARCHIVAL COLLECTIONS

Abraham Lincoln Brigade Archives, The Tamiment Library and Robert F. Wagner Labor Archives, New York University, New York.

Jay Allen papers, Abraham Lincoln Brigade Archives, The Tamiment Library and Robert F. Wagner Labor Archives, New York University, New York.

Gerald Brenan Collection, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center at the University of Texas at Austin, Texas.

Stanley Burnshaw Papers, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center at the University of Texas at Austin, Texas.

Paul Norton MacEachron File, Abraham Lincoln Brigade Archives, The Tamiment Library and Robert F. Wagner Labor Archives, New York University, New York.

José Martínez Guerricabeitia Papers, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Papers of E. Allison Peers, University of Liverpool Special Collections and Archives, Liverpool, UK.

Paul Patrick Rogers Papers, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center at the University of Texas at Austin, Texas.

Paul Patrick Rogers File, no. 100-263307, Federal Bureau of Investigation. FOIA Release May 2005.

Paul Patrick Rogers File, Oberlin College Archives, Oberlin, Ohio.

E.H. Wilkins File, Oberlin College Archives, Oberlin, Ohio.

PUBLISHED WORKS

Adams, Nicholson B. "Some Recent Novels on Revolutionary Spain." *Hispania* 20, no. 1 (1937): 81–84.

Aguilar, Alonso. *Pan Americanism from Monroe to the Present*. New York: MR, 1968.

Aguilar, Paloma. *Memory and Amnesia: The Role of the Spanish Civil War in the Transition to Democracy*. New York: Berghahn, 2002.

Alonso, Carlos J. "Cultural Studies and Hispanism: Been There, Done That." *Siglo XX/Twentieth Century* 14, no. 1–2 (1996): 137–51.

Alpert, Michael. *A New International History of the Spanish Civil War*. London: Macmillan, 1994.

Álvarez Junco, José, and Adrian Shubert. Introduction to *Spanish History Since 1808*, edited by Álvarez Junco and Shubert, 1–17. London: Arnold, 2000.

American Association of University Professors. “1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.” <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/1940statement.htm>.

Amigos de El Olivar. “Etapa de 1936–1945. El Olivar en la Guerra Civil y la Mundial.” *Amigos de El Olivar. El único olivar del centro de Madrid*. <http://www.elolivardechamartin.com/hist/historia8.php>.

Amner, F. Dewey. “Some Aspects of Nationalism in Modern Foreign Language Teaching.” *Modern Language Journal* 20 (1936): 407–10.

Anderson, Danny J., ed. “Cultural Studies and Hispanisms.” Special issue, *Siglo XX/Twentieth Century* 14, no. 1–2 (1996).

Anhalt, Diana. *A Gathering of Fugitives: American Political Expatriates in Mexico, 1948–1965*. Santa María: Archer Books, 2001.

Applebee, Arthur N. *Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: A History*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1974.

Arroyo, Francesc. “Southworth advierte contra los intentos de olvidar la guerra civil.” *El País*, June 11, 1986.

Artigas Ferrando, Miguel. “Clamor de infortunio. A los hispanistas del mundo.” *Heraldo de Aragón*, June 5, 1937.

Atkinson, William C. “Inquest on the Spanish Civil War.” *The Fortnightly* 170 (October 1951): 672–78.

_____. “The Civil War and After.” *The Fortnightly* 140 (October 1936): 412–21.

_____. “Why Learn Spanish?” *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* 1, no. 2 (1924): 74–75.

_____. Review of *Spain, the Church and the Orders*, by E. Allison Peers. *International Affairs* 18, no. 5 (1939): 703.

_____. *Spain: A Brief History*. London: Methuen, 1934.

Avelar, Idelber. “Toward a Genealogy of Latin Americanism.” *Disposition*, no. 49 (1997): 121–33.

Azcárate, Pablo de. *Mi embajada en Londres durante la Guerra Civil Española*. Barcelona: Ariel, 1976.

Balfour, Sebastian. “El hispanismo británico y la historiografía contemporánea en España.” *Ayer* 31 (1998): 163–81.

Bates, Ralph. “The Real Spain.” Review of *The Spanish Labyrinth*, by Gerald Brenan. *The Nation*, September 4, 1943, 270–71.

Beasley-Murray, Jon. Review of *Educating the Educators*, by Malcolm K. Read. *Hispanic Research Journal* 7, no. 2 (2006): 191–92.

Beaton, George [Gerald Brenan]. “Atrocities in Spain.” Letter to the Editor. *New Statesman and Nation*, August 15, 1936, 218.

_____. *Jack Robinson: A Picaresque Novel*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1933.

Bellaigue, Christopher de. “Where Said Was Wrong.” *Times Literary Supplement*, May 17, 2006.

Beltrán Almería, Luis. “La filología hispánica en la encrucijada.” *Quimera*, no. 139 (September 1995): 44–49.

Bergamín, José. “Un caso concreto. Contestando a don José Ortega y Gasset.” *España Peregrina* 1, no. 1 (1940): 32–34.

Berger, Mark T. "A Greater America? Pan Americanism and the Professional Study of Latin America, 1890–1990." In *Beyond the Ideal: Pan Americanism in Inter-American Affairs*, by David Sheinin, 45–56. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2000.

———. *Under Northern Eyes: Latin American Studies and U.S. Hegemony in the Americas 1898–1990*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.

Bérubé, Michael, and Cary Nelson, eds. *Higher Education under Fire: Politics, Economics, and the Crisis of the Humanities*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Beverley, John. "Class or Caste: A Critique of the Castro Thesis." In *Américo Castro: The Impact of His Thought: Essays to Mark the Centenary of His Birth*, edited by Ronald E. Surtz, Jaime Ferrán, and Daniel P. Testa, 141–82. Madison: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1988.

Beverley, John, Goffredo Diana, and Vicente Lecuna. 1996. "A Little Azúcar. Una conversación sobre estudios culturales." *Siglo XX/Twentieth Century* 14, no. 1–2 (1996): 15–35.

Birmingham Post. "France and Spain." July 13, 1942.

Blinkhorn, R. Martin. "Anglo-American Historians and the Second Spanish Republic: The Emergence of a New Orthodoxy." *European Studies Review* 3, no. 1 (1973): 81–87.

Blodgett, Geoffrey. "Campus Life at Oberlin 1930–1945." *Oberlin Alumni Magazine* 93, no. 3 (Winter 1998).

Boletín de Orientación Bibliográfica. Unsigned review of *El mito de la cruzada de Franco*, by Herbert R. Southworth. No. 35–36 (1965): 9–16. <http://www.ruedoiberico.org/libros/textos.php?id=113>.

Bolloten, Burnett. "The Spanish Civil War." Letter to the editor. *Times Literary Supplement*, Nov. 17, 1978, 1340.

———. *The Grand Camouflage: The Communist Conspiracy in the Spanish Civil War*. New York: Praeger, 1961.

———. *El gran engaño*. Barcelona: Luis de Caralt, 1961.

———. *The Grand Camouflage: The Spanish Civil War and Revolution, 1936–39*. New York: Praeger, 1968.

———. *The Spanish Revolution: The Left and the Struggle for Power during the Civil War*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979.

———. *The Spanish Civil War: Revolution and Counterrevolution*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1991.

Borges, Jorge Luis. *Otras inquisiciones*. Buenos Aires: Emecé, 1960.

Borkenau, Franz. "How Deal with Franco?" *Commentary* 12, no. 6 (December 1951): 533–41.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Homo Academicus*. Trans. Peter Collier. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988.

Boyd, Carolyn P. "El hispanismo norteamericano y la historiografía contemporánea de España en la dictadura franquista." In "El Hispanismo y la Historia Contemporánea de España," special issue, *Historia Contemporánea* 20 (2000): 103–16.

Brenan, Gerald, and Ralph Partridge. *Best of Friends: The Brenan-Partridge Letters*, edited by Xan Fielding. London: Chatto and Windus, 1986.

Brenan, Gerald. "A Literary Letter from Madrid." *New York Times Book Review*, August 24, 1952, 4.

_____. "A Literary Letter from Spain." *New York Times Book Review*, October 11, 1953, 10.

_____. "Some Spanish Poets and Others." Review of *St. John of the Cross and Other Lectures*, by E. Allison Peers. *New Statesman and Nation*, June 27, 1946, 68.

_____. "Spain and Its Future." *The Spectator*, November 16, 1945, 453.

_____. "Spain in the Doldrums." Letter to the editor. *London Times*, February 20, 1945, 5.

_____. "Spain Yesterday and Today. Posted on March 19, 1958 to O. Caldecott, Readers Union, 38 William IV Street, W.C.2." Brenan Papers. Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas, Austin.

_____. "Spain." Letter to the Editor. *The New Statesman and Nation*, June 1, 1946, 395.

_____. "Spanish Scene." *Current Affairs* 7 (July 1946): 5-16.

_____. "The Spanish Predicament." Review of *The Structure of Spanish History*, by Américo Castro. *Encounter*, no. 4 (1955): 71-73.

_____. "The Tortured Spain of Claude G. Bowers." Review of *My Mission to Spain*, by Claude G. Bowers. *The Reporter*, October 7, 1954, 43-46.

_____. "Hispanophilia." *New York Review of Books* 8, no. 1 (Dec. 1969).

_____. *Doctor Partridge's Almanack for 1935*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1934.

_____. *Personal Record 1920-1972*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

_____. *South from Granada*. New York: Grove, 1958.

_____. *The Face of Spain*. London: Turnstile, 1950.

_____. *The Face of Spain*. New York: Pellegrini and Cudahy, 1951.

_____. *The Literature of the Spanish People from Roman Times to the Present*. Cleveland: Meridian, 1957.

_____. *The Spanish Labyrinth: An Account of the Social and Political Background of the Spanish Civil War*. Cambridge: Canto, 1990.

[Brenan, Gerald.] "An Eyewitness in Southern Spain: Warfare of the Middle Ages." *Manchester Guardian Weekly*, August 14, 1936, 131. Also in *Manchester Guardian*, August 12, 1936.

Brown, Gordon. "Academic Spain Today." *South Atlantic Bulletin* 6, no. 1 (1940): 1, 5.

_____. "Las actividades culturales en España." *Hispania* 25, vol. 1 (1942): 61-65.

_____. "Culture Activities in Spain." *South Atlantic Bulletin* 7, vol. 4 (1942): 1, 6.

Buchanan, Tom. *The Impact of the Spanish Civil War on Britain: War, Loss and Memory*. Brighton: Sussex Academic, 2007.

Burns Marañón, Tom. *Hispanomanía*. Barcelona: Plaza y Janés, 2000.

Burnshaw, Stanley, ed. *The Poem Itself*. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1995.

Buruma, Ian. "Lost in Translation: The Two Minds of Bernard Lewis." *The New Yorker*, June 14 and 21, 2004, 184–88.

_____. *Voltaire's Coconuts or Anglomania in Europe*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1999.

Calvo Serer, Rafael. *La literatura universal sobre la Guerra de España*. Madrid: Ateneo, 1962.

Carr, Raymond. Foreword to *The Spanish Labyrinth: An Account of the Social and Political Background of the Spanish Civil War*, by Gerald Brenan, vii–xii. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

_____. Introduction to *Spain: A History*, by Carr, 1–9. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

_____. *Richard Ford, Gerald Brenan y el descubrimiento de España por los viajeros*. Valencia: Fundació Bancaixa; London: British Council, 1995.

_____. *Spain 1808–1939*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1966.

_____. *Spain 1808–1975*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.

[Carr, Raymond.] "Franco and the Falange." *Times Literary Supplement*, September 12, 1968, 996.

Casanova, Julián. "Narración, síntesis y primado de la política. El legado de la historiografía angloamericana." In *La Historia en el horizonte del año 2000*, 237–51. Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico, 1995.

Castro, Américo. *The Meaning of Spanish Civilization: The Inaugural Lecture of Américo Castro, Emory L. Ford Professor of Spanish in Princeton U.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, 1941.

_____. *La peculiaridad lingüística rioplatense y su sentido histórico*. Buenos Aires: Losada, 1941.

_____. *España en su historia. Cristianos, moros y judíos*. Buenos Aires: Losada, 1948.

_____. *La realidad histórica de España*. México: Porrúa, 1954.

Cela, Camilo José. *San Camilo, 1936: The Eve, Feast, and Octave of St. Camillus of the Year 1936 in Madrid*. Translated by J. H. R. Polt. Durham: Duke University Press, 1991.

Cenarro Lagunas, Ángela. "Tradición y renovación: los historiadores británicos ante la España contemporánea." In "El Hispanismo y la Historia Contemporánea de España," special issue, *Historia Contemporánea* 20 (2000): 65–102.

Chomsky, Noam. *Objectivity and Liberal Scholarship*. New York: The New Press, 2003.

Cleveland Plain Dealer. "90 from 69 Groups Join Against Fascism." January 28, 1935.

_____. "U.S. Must Avert War." April 9, 1935.

_____. "Asks 3 Theaters to Halt Hearst Films." October 5, 1935.

_____. "Asks Gypsy Rose to Tell of Reds." November 25, 1938.

[Coester, Alfred.] Editorial. *Hispania* 19, vol. 4 (1936): 467.

Cohen, Robert. *When the Old Left Was Young: Student Radicals and America's First Mass Student Movement, 1929–1941*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Colburn, Guy Blandin. "The Twenty-Third Annual Meeting." *Hispania* 23, no. 1 (1940): 1–20.

Commonweal. "American Committee for Spanish Relief." May 14, 1937, 143.

———. "For Spanish Relief." May 28, 1937, 129.

Cunningham, Valentine, ed. *Spanish Front: Writers on the Civil War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Curran, Edward Lodge. *Spain in Arms: With Notes on Communism*. Brooklyn, NY: International Catholic Truth Society, 1936.

———. *Franco: Who is He, What Does He Fight For?* Brooklyn, NY: International Catholic Truth Society, 1937.

Cuthbertson, Stuart. "Escaping from the Spanish Revolution." *Hispania* 19, no. 4 (1936): 451–60.

Darrow, Robert M. "Catholic Political Power: A Study of the Activities of the American Catholic Church on behalf of Franco during the Spanish Civil War, 1936–1939." PhD diss., Columbia University, New York, 1953.

Davies, Catherine. "What Is Hispanic Studies?" In *The Companion to Hispanic Studies*, edited by Davies, 1–12. London: Arnold, 2002.

Deas, Malcolm. "Raymond Carr: Approaches to the History of Spain." In *Élites and Power in Twentieth-Century Spain: Essays in Honour of Sir Raymond Carr*, edited by Paul Preston and Frances Lannon, 1–9. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.

Dennis, Nigel. Prologue to *Epistolario (1919–1935)*, by Manuel de Falla and J. B. Trend, 7–23. Granada: Universidad de Granada, Archivo Manuel de Falla, 2007.

Doubleday, Simon. "English Hispanists and the Discourse of Empiricism." *The Journal of the Historical Society* 3, no. 2 (2003): 205–19.

Doyle, Henry G. "Foreign Politics in the Classroom." *Modern Language Journal* 24, no. 2 (1939): 91–98.

———. "Some Fundamental Problems for the Modern Languages and Literatures." *PMLA* 54, supplement (1939): 1346–55.

Dunthorn, David J. *Britain and the Spanish Anti-Franco Opposition, 1940–1950*. New York: Palgrave, 2000.

Eagan, Eileen. *Class, Culture, and the Classroom: The Student Peace Movement of the 1930s*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981.

Eakin, Marshall C. "Latin American History in the United States: From Gentleman Scholars to Academic Specialists." *The History Teacher* 31, no. 4 (1998): 539–61.

Elliott, John. "El hispanismo británico." *Donaire*, no. 7 (1996): 79–81.

———. "Galería. Sir John Elliott." *Donaire*, no. 7 (1996): 74–79.

———. "Insiders and Outsiders." In *The British Contribution to the Europe of the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Basil Markesinis, 115–28. Oxford: Hart, 2002.

Encyclopedie universal ilustrada europeo-americana. 70 vols. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1908–30.

Entwistle, William J. "Background to the Spanish Civil War." *The Listener* 19, no. 470 (January 12, 1938): 59–62, 91.

———. “British Hispanism during the War.” *Bulletin Hispanique* 48, no. 1 (1946): 44–49.

———. Review of *Spain*, by Salvador de Madariaga. *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* 8, no. 29 (1931): 42–44.

Epps, Brad, and Luis Fernández Cifuentes, eds. *Spain Beyond Spain: Modernity, Literary History, and National Identity*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2005.

Esenwein, George, and Adrian Shubert. *Spain at War: The Spanish Civil War in Context*. London: Longman, 1995.

Esenwein, George. “The Cold War and Anglo-American Historiography of the Spanish Civil War.” Paper given at the annual conference of the Society for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies, University of California, Los Angeles, April 1–4, 2004.

Espinosa, Aurelio M. *The Second Spanish Republic and the Causes of the Counter-Revolution*. San Francisco: Spanish Relief Committee, 1937.

Evans, Richard J. *In Defense of History*. New York: Norton, 1997.

Faber, Sebastiaan. “Contradictions of Left-Wing Hispanismo: The Case of the Spanish Republicans in Mexico.” *Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies* 3, no. 2 (2002): 165–85.

———. “Economies of Prestige: The Place of Iberian Studies in the American University.” *Hispanic Research Journal* 9, no. 1 (2008): 7–32.

———. “‘La hora ha llegado’: Hispanism, Pan-Americanism, and the Hope of Spanish/American Glory (1938–1948).” *Ideologies of Hispanism*. Ed. Mabel Moraña. 62–104. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2005.

Fagg, John E. *Pan Americanism*. Malabar, FL: Krieger, 1982.

Fernández Cifuentes, Luis. “Discursos del método.” *Quimera*, no. 139 (September 1995): 36–43.

Fernández, James D. “Longfellow’s Law: The Place of Latin America and Spain in U.S. Hispanism, circa 1915,” in *Spain Beyond Spain: Modernity, Literary History, and National Identity*, edited by Brad Epps and Luis Fernández Cifuentes, 49–69. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press

———. “Nueva York: The Spanish-Speaking Community Responds.” In *Facing Fascism: New York and the Spanish Civil War*, edited by Peter N. Carroll and James D. Fernández, 84–91. New York: Museum of the City of New York and NYUP, 2007.

Fife, Robert Herndon. “Nationalism and Scholarship.” *PMLA* 59, supplement (1944): 1282–94.

Fish, Stanley. “Save the World on Your Own Time.” *Chronicle of Higher Education* 49, January 23, 2003.

———. “Why We Built the Ivory Tower.” *New York Times*, May 21, 2004.

Flint, Charles Wesley. “Academic Freedom.” *Educational Record* 16, no. 4 (1935): 433–43.

Flint, James. “Must God Go Fascist?: English Catholic Opinion and the Spanish Civil War.” *Church History* 56, no. 3 (1987): 364–74.

Forment, Albert. *José Martínez. La epopeya de Ruedo Ibérico*. Barcelona: Anagrama, 2000.

Fox, Soledad. *Constancia de la Mora in War and Exile: International Voice for the Spanish Republic*. Brighton: Sussex Academic; Cañada Blanch Centre for Contemporary Spanish Studies, 2007.

Frank, Waldo. "Our Crime against Spain." Review of *The Face of Spain*, by Gerald Brenan. *The New Republic*, December 31, 1951, 19–20.

_____. *America Hispana: A Portrait and a Prospect*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931.

Gathorne-Hardy, Jonathan. *Gerald Brenan: The Interior Castle*. New York: Norton, 1993.

Gibson, Ian. "Gerald Brenan, vividor impenitente." In *La imagen de Andalucía en los viajeros románticos y Homenaje a Gerald Brenan*, 171–80. Málaga: Diputación Provincial, 1984.

Gieryn, Thomas F. "Boundary-Work and the Demarcation of Science from Non-Science: Strains and Interests in Professional Ideologies of Scientists." *American Sociological Review* 48, no. 6 (1983): 781–95.

Goytisolo, Juan. "El ayer, hoy y mañana en la España de Américo Castro." *Claves de razón práctica* 98 (1999): 8–10.

Graff, Gerald. *Beyond the Culture Wars: How Teaching the Conflicts Can Revitalize American Education*. New York: Norton, 1992.

_____. *Professing Literature: An Institutional History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Grant, Helen F. "From a Spanish Diary." In *Women's Voices from the Spanish Civil War*, edited by Jim Fyrth and Sally Alexander, 180–87. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1991.

_____. "Professor John Brande Trend." *Cambridge Review* 79 (1957): 594–95.

_____. "Rica Brown 1909–1984." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 62, no. 2 (1985): 185–88.

Greene, Thomas R. "The English Catholic Press and the Second Spanish Republic." *Church History* 45, no. 1 (1976): 70–84.

Guerrero de la Torre, Ana, and Abdón Mateos. "Algunas notas sobre el hispanismo británico. Del *Laberinto Español* de Brenan al *Franco* de Preston." *Spagna Contemporánea* 8 (1995): 133–47.

Gullón, Germán. "Desde el exilio: perspectiva intelectual de José Ortega y Gasset." *Los ensayistas*, no. 8–9 (1980): 23–35.

Guttman, Allen. *The Wound in the Heart: America and the Spanish Civil War*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.

Hart, Stephen M. "From Schizoidism to Big Bang: UK versus US Hispanism." *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* 84, no. 4–5 (2007): 653–67.

Haskell, Thomas L. "Objectivity Is Not Neutrality: Rhetoric vs. Practice in Peter Novick's *That Noble Dream*." *History and Theory* 29, no. 2 (1990): 129–57.

Havens, George R. "The Modern Language Teacher in a Troubled World." *Modern Language Journal* 25, no. 4 (1941): 306–13.

Hemingway, Ernest. *For Whom the Bell Tolls*. New York: Scribner's, 1986.

Hespelt, E. Herman. "Spanish in a Changing World." *Hispania* 22, no. 1 (1939): 1–7.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. *Age of Extremes: A History of the World, 1914–1991*. New York: Vintage, 1996.

Hopkins, James K. *Into the Heart of Fire: The British in the Spanish Civil War*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Horowitz, David. "What I Told Pennsylvania's Academic Freedom Hearings." *Front Page Magazine*, January 11, 2006. <http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=20855> (accessed 17 May 2006).

—. *The Professors: The 101 Most Dangerous Academics in America*. Washington, DC: Regnery, 2006.

Howson, Gerald. *Arms for Spain: The Untold Story of the Spanish Civil War*. New York: St Martin's, 1999.

Hughes, Langston. *I Wonder As I Wander: An Autobiographical Journey*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1956.

Hull Daily Mail. "Spain—3 More Years of Conflict?" January 20, 1937.

Hurtley, Jacqueline A. "Wandering between the Wars: Walter Starkie's Di/Visions." In *Post/Imperial Encounters: Anglo-Hispanic Cultural Relations*, edited by Juan E Tazón-Salces and Isabel Carrera Suárez, 51–62. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005.

Irwin, Robert. *For Lust of Knowing: The Orientalists and their Enemies*. London: Allen Lane, 2006.

Jackson, Angela. *British Women and the Spanish Civil War*. London: Routledge/ Cañada Blanch, 2002.

Jackson, Gabriel. "Homenaje a Gerald Brenan." In *La imagen de Andalucía en los viajeros románticos y homenaje a Gerald Brenan*, edited by Alberto González Troyano, 155–60. Málaga: Diputación Provincial, 1987.

—. "Recordando a Herbert Southworth." *El País*, December 18, 1999.

—. "The Problem of Land Reform, the Church, and Education in Republican Spain, 1931–33." PhD diss., Leland Stanford Junior University, 1950.

Johnson, Roberta. "José Rubia Barcia: Ethical Humanist." *Hispania* 80, no. 2 (1997): 290–92.

Jordan, Barry. *British Hispanism and the Challenge of Literary Theory*. Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1990.

Juderías, Julián. *La leyenda negra. Estudios acerca del concepto de España en el extranjero*. Madrid: Editora Nacional, 1954.

Juliá, Santos. "Raymond Carr: 'El historiador debe rechazar la visión de España como un país excepcional.'" *Babelia. El País*, April 21, 2001. <http://www.elpais.es/suplementos/babelia/20010421/b12.html>.

Kagan, Richard L. "Prescott's Paradigm: American Historical Scholarship and the Decline of Spain." *The American Historical Review* 101, no. 2 (1996): 423–46.

—. Introduction to *Spain in America: The Origins of Hispanism in the United States*, edited by Kagan, 1–19. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002.

—, ed. *Spain in America: The Origins of Hispanism in the United States*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002.

Kenwood, Alun. "Art, Propaganda, Commitment: Hispanic Literature and the War," in *The Spanish Civil War: A Cultural and Historical Reader*, edited by Kenwood, 27–38. Oxford: Berg, 1993.

Klein, Richard B. "The American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese: The First 75 Years." *Hispania* 75, no. 3 (1992): 1036–79.

Kloppenburg, James T. "Objectivity and Historicism: A Century of American Historical Writing." *American Historical Review* 94, no. 4 (1989): 1011–30.

Kluckhohn, Frank L. "The Spanish Tragedy." Review of *The Spanish Tragedy*, by E. Allison Peers. *New York Times Book Review*, November 22, 1936, 16.

Koch, Stephen. *The Breaking Point: Hemingway, Dos Passos, and the Murder of José Robles*. New York: Counterpoint, 2005.

Langdon-Davies, John. *Gatherings from Catalonia*. London: Cassell, 1953.

Langnas, Izaak A. and Barton Sholod. *Studies in Honor of M.J. Benardete*. New York: Las Américas, 1965.

Leavitt, Sturgis E. "The Teaching of Spanish in the United States." *Hispania* 44, no. 4 (1961): 591–625.

Leonard, Irving A. Review of *Catalonia Infelix*, by E. Allison Peers. *Hispanic American Historical Review* 18, no. 3 (1938): 384–86.

Lewis, Bernard. "The Question of Orientalism." *New York Review of Books*, June 24, 1982. <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/6547>.

———. "We Must Be Clear." *Washington Post*, September 16, 2001.

Lindholm-Romantschuk, Ylva. "Disciplinarity: The Nature and Structure of Scholarly Disciplines." In *Scholarly Book Reviewing in the Social Sciences and the Humanities: The Flow of Ideas within and among Disciplines*, by Lindholm-Romantschuk, 23–34. Westport: Greenwood, 1998.

Loureiro, Ángel G. "Desolación y miseria del hispanismo." *Quimera*, no. 139 (Sept. 1995): 31–36.

Lowen, Rebecca S. *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Macaulay, Rose. *Fabled Shore: From the Pyrenees to Portugal*. London: Hamilton, 1949.

Mackenzie, Ann L. "Publications of A. A. Parker: A Chronological List." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 61, no. 3 (1984): 267–70.

Madariaga, Salvador de, et al. "Arrests in Spain." Letter to the Editor. *London Times*, January 1, 1959.

Mainer, José Carlos. "Reconstruir la España contemporánea (entre la literatura y la historia)." *Ayer* 31 (1998): 83–97.

Manning, Warren F. "A Visit to Menéndez Pidal." *Hispania* 29, no. 4 (1946): 519–22.

Marías, Javier. *Todas las almas*. Madrid: Anagrama, 1989.

———. *Negra espalda del tiempo*. Madrid: Alfaguara, 1998.

———. *Tu rostro mañana 1. Fiebre y lanza*. Madrid: Alfaguara, 2002.

———. *Tu rostro mañana 2. Baile y sueño*. Madrid: Alfaguara, 2004.

———. *Tu rostro mañana 3. Veneno y sombra y adiós*. Madrid: Alfaguara, 2007.

Mariscal, George. "An Introduction to the Ideology of Hispanism in the US and Britain." In *Conflicts of Discourse: Spanish Literature in the Golden Age*, edited by Peter W. Evans, 1–25. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990.

Markham, James M. "Young in Spain Adopt 'El Ingles' As Hero—at 83." *New York Times*, October 9, 1977, 59.

Marrero, Vicente. *La guerra española y el trust de cerebros*. Madrid: Ediciones Punta Europa, 1961.

Martín-Estudillo, Luis, Francisco Ocampo, and Nicholas Spadaccini, eds. "Debating Hispanic Studies: Reflections on Our Disciplines." Special issue, *Hispanic Issues On Line* 1, no. 1 (2006).

Martínez del Pisón, Ignacio. *Enterrar a los muertos*. Barcelona: Seix Barral, 2005.

Matthews, Herbert L. *A World in Revolution: A Newspaperman's Memoir*. New York: Scribner's, 1971.

McGaha, Michael. "Whatever Happened to Hispanism?" *Journal of Hispanic Philology* 14, no. 3 (1990): 225–30.

McKegney, James C. "The Progress of Latin American Studies in Great Britain." *Hispania* 51, no. 2. (1968): 317–20.

McKendrick, Melveena. "Helen Grant (1903–1992)." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 70, no. 3 (1993): 351–52.

McNamara, Patrick J. "Pro-Franco Sentiment and Activity in New York City." In *Facing Fascism: New York and the Spanish Civil War*, edited by Peter N. Carroll and James D. Fernández, 93–101. New York: Museum of the City of New York and NYUP, 2007.

Menéndez Pidal, Ramón and Warren F. Manning. "Corrections." *Hispania* 30, no. 2 (1947): 226–27.

Messer-Davidow, Ellen, David R. Shumway, and David J. Sylvan. "Introduction: Disciplinary Ways of Knowing." In *Knowledges: Historical and Critical Studies in Disciplinarity*, edited by Messer-Davidow, Shumway, and Sylvan, 1–24. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1993.

Metford, J. C. J. *British Contributions to Spanish and Spanish-American Studies*. London: The British Council, 1950.

Meyer, Leo J. Rev. of *Catalonia Infelix*, by E. Allison Peers. *The Journal of Modern History* 11, no. 3 (1939): 379–80.

Michael, Ian. "Sir Peter Russell (1913–2004)." *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* 83, no. 8 (2006): 1133–44.

—. "Spanish at Oxford 1595–1998." *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* 76, no. 1 (1999): 173–93.

Mir, Gregori. "Visió de Catalunya des d'Anglaterra durant la guerra d'Espanya 1936–1939." *Journal of Catalan Studies* 5 (2002). <http://www.uoc.es/jocs/5/articles/mir/index.html>.

Molinero, Carme, Margarida Sala, and Jaume Sobrequés, eds. *Una inmensa prisión. Los campos de concentración y las prisiones durante guerra civil y franquismo*. Barcelona: Crítica, 2003.

Moradiellos, Enrique. "El espejo distante: España en el hispanismo británico contemporáneo." *Revista de Extremadura* 24 (1997): 7–38.

_____. "Más allá de la Leyenda Negra y del Mito Romántico. El concepto de España en el hispanismo británico contemporáneo." In "España. La mirada del otro," special issue, *Ayer* 31 (1998): 183–99.

_____. "The Gentle General: The Official British Perception of General Franco during the Spanish Civil War." In *The Republic Besieged: Civil War in Spain 1936–1939*, edited by Paul Preston and Ann L. Mackenzie, 1–19. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996.

Morán, Gregorio. *El maestro en el exilio. Ortega y Gasset y la cultura del franquismo*. Barcelona: Tusquets, 1998.

Moran, Joe. *Interdisciplinarity*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Moraña, Mabel, ed. *Ideologies of Hispanism*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2005.

Moreiras, Alberto. "Neohispanismo y política de la cultura." *Journal of Hispanic Research* 2 (1993–94): 407–16.

Morgan, Ted. *Reds: McCarthyism in Twentieth-Century America*. New York: Random House, 2004.

Morley, S. Griswold. "William James Entwistle: Two Memoirs." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 29, no. 116 (1952): 183–89.

Namias, June. *First Generation: In the Words of Twentieth-Century American Immigrants*. Boston: Beacon, 1978.

Nation. "The Shape of Things." Editorial. October 3, 1936, 379–80.

Navarro Tomás, Tomás. *A los hispanistas del mundo. A Message to American Teachers of Spanish*. New York: Spanish Information Bureau, 1937.

New York Herald Tribune, "15,000 Attend Spanish Relief Garden Session," May 20, 1937.

New York Times. "15,000 Take Pledge to Work for Peace." September 7, 1936.

_____. "Peace Parade Here in Spanish Section." November 12, 1936.

_____. "Lawyers Ask Help for Loyalist Spain." March 13, 1938.

_____. "Belloc Denounces Spanish Loyalists." March 20, 1937.

_____. "Urges Recognition of Franco Regime: Dr. J. F. Thorning Says Precedents Back Our Acceptance." April 2, 1938.

_____. "Bias on Spain Denied by New Relief Group," April 11, 1937, 34.

_____. "War Aid is Linked to Franco's Cause," May 5, 1937, 17.

_____. "Two Drives Pressed for Relief in Spain," May 6, 1937, 5.

_____. "3 Years' Conflict Feared for Spain," May 12, 1937, 18.

_____. "Mass of Spaniards Called Rightists," May 14, 1937, 8.

_____. "Spain Group Here Bars Partisanship," May 18, 1937, 15.

_____. "15,000 At Rally Aid A Fund For Spain," May 20, 1937, 8.

_____. "Aid for Spain Cut by High Expenses," September 4, 1937, 4.

Norwood, Stephen H. "Marauding Youth and the Christian Front: Antisemitic Violence in Boston and New York During World War II." *American Jewish History* 91, no. 2 (2004): 233–67.

"Noticias literarias." *Revista Hispánica Moderna* 4 (1937–38): 43–47.

Novick, Peter. *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Oberlin Review. "Rogers Lectures on 'Spain Today.'" October 13, 1936, 3.

———. "Professor Rogers Analyses Spain's Domestic Problems." November 3, 1933.

———. "ASU Would Help Spain." December 4, 1936, 1.

———. "Dean Wittke Suggests Aiding Both Armies in Spanish Conflict." January 14, 1938, 1.

———. "ASU Will Assist Young Loyalists." January 18, 1938, 4.

———. "MacEachron Captured by Insurgents." March 25, 1938, 1.

———. "Dies Starts Local 'Red' Probe." November 29, 1938, 1.

———. "Spanish Club to Hear Rogers on October 29." October 19, 1937, 1.

———. "Library Exhibit Points to Spain." March 8, 1938, 1.

Ohmann, Richard. "English and the Cold War." In *The Cold War and the University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years*, edited by André Schiffrin, 73–105. New York: The New Press, 1997.

Ortega y Gasset, José. "Concerning Pacifism." *The Nineteenth Century and After* 124 (1938): 20–34.

Orwell, George. "Notes on Nationalism." In *Essays*, edited by John Carey, 865–84. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002.

Ottanelli, Fraser M. "The New York City Left and the Spanish Civil War." In *Facing Fascism: New York and the Spanish Civil War*, edited by Peter N. Carroll and James D. Fernández, 60–69. New York: Museum of the City of New York and NYUP, 2007.

———. *The Communist Party of the United States: From the Depression to World War II*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1991.

El País. "Una comisión hispano-alemán [sic] investigará el bombardeo de Guernica." February 12, 1978.

Parker, Alexander A. "Don Quixote" and the Relativity of Truth." *Dublin Review* 220, no. 441 (1947): 28–37.

———. "An Introduction to Spanish Culture." *Aberdeen University Review* 27, no. 80 (1940): 126–34.

———. "Carlism in the Spanish Civil War." *Studies* 26 (1937): 383–98.

———. "Menéndez Pidal and 'The Two Spains.'" *Dublin Review* 224, no. 449 (1950): 103–7.

———. "Roots of the Spanish Dilemma." *Cambridge Journal* 6, no. 8 (1953): 451–74.

———. "Spain's Catholic Awakening." *Blackfriars* 14 (February 1933): 142–47.

———. "Spanish Civilization in America." *Blackfriars* 28, no. 329 (1947): 355–61.

———. "The Cervantes Centenary in Madrid." *Aberdeen University Review* 32, no. 98 (1948): 198–99.

———. "The Spanish Republic." *Blackfriars* 12, no. 135 (June 1931): 331–43.

———. "The Struggle in Spain—I." *Catholic Herald*, September 1, 1934.

———. "The Struggle in Spain—IV." *Catholic Herald*, October 6, 1934.

———. "Victory and Defeat in Spain." *Blackfriars* 11, no. 126 (September 1930): 528–39.

———. *The Catholic Church in Spain from 1800 till to-day*. London: Catholic Truth Society, 1938.

———. *Valor actual del humanismo español*. Madrid: Ateneo, 1952.

Pastor, Antonio. *Breve historia del hispanismo inglés*. Madrid: Arbor, 1948.

Pattee, Richard. *This is Spain*. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1951.

Payne, Stanley G. Review of *Le mythe de la croisade de Franco*, by H. R. Southworth. *The American Historical Review* 71, no. 1 (1965): 211.

———. Review of *Antifalange*, by H. R. Southworth. *The American Historical Review* 73, no. 2 (1967): 503–4.

———. “José Antonio Primo de Rivera and the Beginning of Falange Española.” Master’s thesis, Claremont Graduate School, 1957.

———. *Falange: A History of Spanish Fascism*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1961.

Peers, E. Allison. “A ‘Third Republic’ May Be in Store for Modern Spain.” *Catholic Herald*, September 11, 1942.

———. “A Besieged City: Life in Oviedo.” Peers Papers, Liverpool University, Liverpool, UK.

———. “A Constitution for Spain.” *The Week-end Review*, September 5, 1931, 269–70.

———. “Autonomy in Spain.” *Commonweal*, May 14, 1937, 65–66.

———. “Catalonia in the Civil War. II. The Future of a Nation.” *The Tablet*, November 13, 1937, 649–51.

———. “Catalonia’s Dilemma in Spanish Civil War: Whoever Wins, Home Rule Ideals are Doomed.” *Daily Telegraph*, March 10, 1937.

———. “Church ‘Wealth’ in Spain.” *Commonweal*, March 11, 1938, 537–38.

———. “Crisis in Spain.” *The Nineteenth Century and After* 116 (1934): 505–12.

———. “France and Spain. Important Post-War Problems. Dead Governments and Live People.” *Birmingham Post*, July 13, 1942.

———. “Franco’s Victory Draws Nearer: Prospects of Peace and Progress.” Manuscript. Peers Papers, Liverpool University, Liverpool, UK.

———. “General Franco’s New Spain.” *Dublin Review* ser. 4:200:401 (1937): 221–31.

———. Letter to the Editor. *London Times*, November 26, 1951, 5.

———. “Majorca Revisited.” *Fortnightly* 169 (1951): 385–90.

———. “Manuel Azaña: Stock Obit, February 1937.” Peers Papers, Liverpool University, Liverpool, UK.

———. “Picture of a Nation.” *Catholic World* 147 (1938): 228–29.

———. “Pendulum over Spain.” *The Nineteenth Century and After* 120 (1936): 275–86.

———. “Religion in Spain: Hierarchy and the Republic.” Letter to the editor. *London Times*, May 31, 1938, 12.

———. “Report of a Recent Religious Delegation to Spain. April 1937.” Review. Manuscript. Peers Papers, Liverpool University, Liverpool, UK.

———. “Spain To-Day and Tomorrow.” Box XXI. Peers Papers, Liverpool University, Liverpool, UK.

———. “Spain Week by Week,” *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* 18, no. 3 (1941): 150–53.

———. “The Church in Spain.” Letter to the Editor. *Church Times*, March 5, 1937, 280.

———. “The Evolution of the New Spain.” *Dublin Review* 202, no. 404 (1938): 1–12.

———. “The Religious Situation in Spain.” *Studies* 22 (1933): 361–72.

———. “The Spain that Had No Easter.” *Commonweal*, May 7, 1937, 39–40.

———. “The Spanish Civil War: Causes, Responsibility and Conduct. Commonweal, Saturday April 29, 1937.” Peers Papers, Liverpool University, Liverpool, UK.

———. “The Spanish Labyrinth.” *Spectator*, April 9, 1943, 341.

———. “The War of All the Spains.” *Tablet*, November 7, 1936, 625–27.

———. “Two Hundred Years of Spanish Church History.” *Thought: Fordham University Quarterly* 13 (1938): 269–82.

———. “Uncertainty in Spain: The Weakness of the Monarchy: A Personal Survey.” *Observer*, May 20, 1934. Peers Papers, Liverpool University, Liverpool, UK.

———. “Worthy of Consideration.” Review of *Invertebrate Spain*, by José Ortega y Gasset; *Franco Means Business*, by Georges Rotvand; and *Spanish Journey*, by Eleanor Tennant. *Commonweal*, July 9, 1937, 288–90.

———. *A History of the Romantic Movement in Spain*. Cambridge, Eng.: The University Press, 1940.

———. *Granada*. New York: Knopf, 1929.

———. *Our Debt to Spain*. London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1938.

———. *Ramon Lull: A Biography*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1929.

———. *Redbrick University Revisited: The Autobiography of “Bruce Truscot,”* edited by Ann L. Mackenzie and Adrian R. Allan. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1996.

———. Review of *The Civilization of Spain*, by J. B. Trend. *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* 21, no. 83 (1944): 180–82.

———. *Royal Seville*. New York and London: Harper and Bros., 1926.

———. *Spanish—Now*. London: Methuen, 1944.

———. *The Spanish Tragedy, 1930–1936: Dictatorship, Republic, Chaos*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1936.

———. *Studies of the Spanish Mystics*. 3 vols. London: Sheldon, 1927; London: S.P.C.K., 1951; London: S.P.C.K., 1960.

———. “Literatures of Spain.” Review of *The Literature of the Spanish People*, by Gerald Brenan. *Times Educational Supplement*, October 19, 1951, 806.

Pike, Frederick B. *FDR’s Good Neighbor Policy*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995.

———. *The United States and Latin America: Myths and Stereotypes of Civilization and Nature*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1992.

Poblete, Juan. Introduction to *Critical Latin American and Latino Studies*, edited by Poblete, vii–xli. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.

Prada Samper, José Manuel. *El pájaro que canta el bien y el mal. La vida y los cuentos tradicionales de Azcaria Prieto (1883–1970)*. Madrid: Lengua de Trapo, 2004.

Praz, Mario. *Unromantic Spain*. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1929.

Preston, Paul, and Frances Lannon. Preface to *Elites and Power in Twentieth-Century Spain: Essays in Honour of Sir Raymond Carr*, edited by Preston and Lannon, v–viii. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.

Preston, Paul. “War of Words: The Spanish Civil War and the Historians,” in *Revolution and War in Spain, 1931–1939*, edited by Preston, 1–13. London: Routledge, 1993.

———. Prologue to *Conspiracy and the Spanish Civil War: The Brainwashing of Francisco Franco*, by Herbert R. Southworth, ix–xv. London: Routledge/Cañada Blanch, 2002.

———. *Idealistas bajo las balas. Correspondales extranjeros en la guerra de España*. Madrid: Debate, 2007. Forthcoming in English as *We Saw Spain Die. Foreign Correspondents in the Spanish Civil War* (London: Constable-Robinson).

———. *The Spanish Civil War, 1936–1939*. Chicago: Dorsey, 1986.

———. *The Spanish Civil War: Reaction, Revolution, and Revenge*. Revised and expanded edition. New York: Norton, 2007.

———. Prologue to *El mito de la cruzada de Franco*, by Herbert R. Southworth. Barcelona: Random House Mondadori, 2008.

Pritchett, V. S. *The Spanish Temper*. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Protección del tesoro bibliográfico nacional. *Réplica a Miguel Artigas*. Valencia: Junta Central del Tesoro Artístico, 1937.

Read, Malcolm K. “How’s Tricks?” *Journal of Hispanic Research* 3 (1994–95): 453–67.

———. “Writing in the Institution: The Politics of British Hispanism.” *Journal of Hispanic Philology* 15 (1991): 140–48.

———. *Educating the Educators: Hispanism and its Institutions*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2003.

———. *Language, Text, Subject: A Critique of Hispanism*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 1992.

———. “Travelling South: Ideology and Hispanism.” *Journal of Hispanic Philology* 15 (1991): 193–207.

Records of British Foreign Office and MI5 Intelligence Gathering and Surveillance of Spanish Individuals, 1936–1945. Special Collections, University of California at San Diego, San Diego.

Reid, John T. “Spain as Seen by Some Contemporary American Writers.” *Hispania* 20 (1937): 139–50.

Resina, Joan Ramon. “Hispanism and Its Discontents.” *Siglo XX/Twentieth Century* 14, no. 1–2 (1996): 85–135.

———. “Cold War Hispanism and the New Deal of Cultural Studies,” in *Spain Beyond Spain: Modernity, Literary History, and National Identity*, edited by Brad Epps and Luis Fernández Cifuentes, 70–108. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2005.

Rey García, Marta. *Stars for Spain. La Guerra Civil Española en los Estados Unidos*. A Coruña: Ediciós do Castro, 1997.

Ribbans, Geoffrey. "E. Allison Peers: A Centenary Reappraisal." *Spain and Its Literature: Essays in Memory of E. Allison Peers*, edited by Ann L. Mackenzie, 19–34. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1997.

Richards, Michael. *Un tiempo de silencio. La guerra civil y la cultura de la represión en la España de Franco, 1936–1945*. Barcelona: Crítica, 1999.

Ríos-Font, Wadda. "National Literature in the Protean Nation: The Question of Nineteenth-Century Spanish Literary History." In *Spain Beyond Spain: Modernity, Literary History, and National Identity*, edited by Brad Epps and Luis Fernández Cifuentes, 127–47. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2005.

Riquer i Permanyer, Borja de. *L'últim Cambó. La dreta catalanista davant la guerra civil i el primer franquisme*. Vic: Eumo, 1996.

Robertson, Ian. *Richard Ford, 1796–1858: Hispanophile, Connoisseur and Critic*. Norwich: Michael Russell, 2004.

Rodrigo, Javier. *Los campos de concentración franquistas*. Madrid: Siete Mares, 2003.

Rogers, Douglass, "Paul Patrick Rogers and his 'Spanish Journey' of 1937." Lecture given at Oberlin College, May 4, 2002.

Rogers, Paul P. "Ajuste de cuentas." Trans. J[osé] H[errera] P[etere]. *El Nacional. Suplemento Cultural*, February 14, 1943, 1.

_____. "Galdós Suggested a League of Nations." *Hispania* 12, no. 5 (1929): 465–67.

_____. "García Lorca and His Friends: Some Anecdotes Recalled by Pictures." *Library Chronicle of the University of Texas* 13 (1980): 12–26.

_____. "Grub Street in Spain." *Hispania* 25, no. 1 (1942): 39–48.

_____. "New Facts on Bécquer's *Historia de los templos de España*." *Hispanic Review* 8, no. 4 (1940): 311–20.

_____. "Republican Posters of the Spanish Civil War." *New Letters* 45, no. 3 (1979): 21–27.

_____. "Spanish Influence on the Literature of France," *Hispania* 9, no. 4 (1926): 205–35.

_____. "Spanish Journey." Diary, August 8–24, 1937. Paul Patrick Rogers Collection. Harry Ransom Humanities Resource Center, University of Texas at Austin. Folder 5.

_____. "The Culture of Spain." *Fight*, August 1937, 25–26.

_____. "The Spanish Civil War Collection." *Library Chronicle of the University of Texas* 7 (1974): 86–101.

_____. "Tom Johnson's Town." *Fight*, March 1937, 22–23, 30.

_____. Diary, June 8–August 7, 1937. Photocopy supplied to author by Douglass Rogers.

_____. *Spanish for the First Year*. 2nd edition. New York: Macmillan, 1964.

_____. "The Culture of Spain." *Fight*, August 1937, 25–26.

_____. *Escritores contemporáneos de México*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1949.

_____. *Florilegio de cuentos españoles*. New York: Macmillan, 1961.

———. *The Spanish Drama Collection in the Oberlin College Library: A Descriptive Catalog*. Oberlin, OH: Oberlin College, 1940.

———. *Goldoni in Spain*. Oberlin, OH: Academy, 1943.

Rogers, Paul P. and Felipe-Antonio Lapuente. *Diccionario de seudónimos literarios españoles, con algunas iniciales*. Madrid: Gredos, 1977.

Romera Navarro, M. *El hispanismo en Norteamérica*. Madrid: Renacimiento, 1917.

Rosaldo, Renato. *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis*. Boston: Beacon, 1989.

Round, Nicholas G. "The Politics of Hispanism Reconstrued." *Journal of Hispanic Research* 1 (1992–93): 134–47.

Rowell, Chester H. "The Relationship of the Various Freedoms of Speech." *Educational Record* 18, no. 3 (July 1937): 401–11.

Ruiz Mas, José. "The Face of Spain, by Gerald Brenan: Libro de viajes propagandístico a favor de Don Juan de Borbón." *Grove: Working Papers on English Studies*, no. 6 (1999): 161–76.

Russell, Bertrand. "Spain's Civil War: A Struggle for Liberty and against Tyranny." Letter to the Editor. *Manchester Guardian Weekly*, August 14, 1936, 131. Also published as "The Spanish Conspiracy." Letter to the Editor. *New Statesman and Nation*, August 15, 1936, 218; and as "Spain's Civil War." Letter to the Editor. *Manchester Guardian*, August 12, 1936, 18. Reprinted in *Yours Faithfully, Bertrand Russell: A Lifelong Fight for Peace, Justice, and Truth in Letters to the Editor*, edited by Ray Perkins, Jr. Chicago: Open Court, 2002, 111–12.

Sacks, Norman P. "Herbert Matthews Reports on Spain." *Hispania* 40, no. 4 (1957): 417–25.

———. "The Making of the Hispanist 1966" *Hispania* 50, no. 1 (1967): 23–34.

Sagalyn, Arnold. "The Red Menace Comes to Oberlin!" *Oberlin Review*, November 29, 1938, 2.

Said, Edward W. *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*. 2nd edition. New York: Vintage, 1997.

———. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 1994.

———. *Representations of the Intellectual. The 1993 Reith Lectures*. New York: Vintage, 1996.

Samaniego, Fernando. "Todavía no se ha publicado en España toda la verdad sobre Guernica." *El País*, April 21, 1977.

San Román, Gustavo. "The Rise of Modern Latin American Studies in the UK: A Questionnaire to Early Practitioners." *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* 84, no. 4 (2007): 447–94.

Saunders, Frances Stonor. *The Cultural Cold War: The CIA and the World of Arts and Letters*. New York: The New Press, 2001.

Schiffrin, André, ed. *The Cold War and the University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years*. New York: The New Press, 1997.

Schrecker, Ellen W. *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

———. "Worse Than McCarthy." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 52, no. 23 (February 10, 2006): 20.

Schreiber, Rebecca M. "The Cold War Culture of Political Exile: U.S. Artists and Writers in Mexico, 1940–1965." PhD diss., Yale University, 2000.

Shkляр, Judith. *Political Thought and Political Thinkers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Shotwell, James T. "The Spanish Bishops' Letter." Letter to the editor. *New York Times*, September 7, 1937.

Shumway, David R., and Craig Dionne Introduction to *Disciplining English: Alternative Histories, Critical Perspectives*, edited by Shumway and Dionne, 1–17. Albany: SUNY, 2002.

Shumway, David R., and Ellen Messer-Davidow. "Disciplinarity: An Introduction." *Poetics Today* 12, no. 2 (1991): 201–25.

Shumway, Nicolas. "Hispanism in an Imperfect Past and an Uncertain Present." *Ideologies of Hispanism*, edited by Mabel Moraña, 284–99. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2005.

Silverman, Joseph H. "Three Windows on Spain." *The Nation*, September 7, 1957, 113–16.

Simpson, Christopher, ed. *Universities and Empire: Money and Politics in the Social Sciences During the Cold War*. New York: The New Press, 1998.

Sitwell, Sacheverell. *Spain*. London: Batsford, 1950.

Smith, Eric R. "New York's Aid to the Spanish Republic." In *Facing Fascism: New York and the Spanish Civil War*, edited by Peter N. Carroll and James D. Fernández, 40–51. New York: Museum of the City of New York and NYUP, 2007.

Smith, Paul Julian. *Writing in the Margin: Spanish Literature of the Golden Age*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1988.

Sontag, Susan. *Regarding the Pain of Others*. New York: Picador, 2003.

Southworth, H. Rutledge, and Willard R. Espy. "Franco in the Caribbean." *The Nation*, November 23, 1940, 500–503.

Southworth, Herbert R. "A modo de prólogo." In *El mito de la cruzada de Franco*, by Southworth, 9–33. Barcelona: Plaza y Janés, 1986.

—. "The Spanish Civil War." Letter to the Editor. *Times Literary Supplement*, October 13, 1978, 1162.

—. "'The Grand Camouflage': Julián Gorkin, Burnett Bolloten and the Spanish Civil War." In *The Republic Besieged: Civil War in Spain 1936–1939*, edited by Paul Preston and Ann L. Mackenzie, 261–310. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1996.

—. "Apology for Revolt." *Washington Post*, July 7, 1937, 9.

—. "Desde el rencor." *El País*, July 1, 1986.

—. "Escape at Teruel." *Washington Post*, December 26, 1937, B8.

—. "Franco's Friend." Rev. of *America—Look at Spain*, by Merwin K. Hart. *The Nation*, June 10, 1939, 677–78.

—. "Franco's Friend." *Washington Post*, November 24, 1937, 9.

—. "Guernica." Letter to the Editor. *Times Literary Supplement*, June 13, 1975, 662–63.

—. "Los bibliófobos. Ricardo de la Cierva y sus colaboradores." *Ruedo Ibérico*, no. 28–29 (December 1970–March 1971): 19–45.

_____. "Spain in Tatters." *Washington Post*, January 31, 1937, B7.

_____. "The Catholic Press." *The Nation*, December 16, 1939, 675–78.

_____. "The Divisions of the Left." *Times Literary Supplement*, June 8, 1978, 11–12.

_____. "The Spanish Phalanx and Latin America." *Foreign Affairs* 18, no. 1–4 (1939–40): 148–52.

_____. "The War beyond the Pyrenees." *Times Literary Supplement*, March 19, 1976, 326.

_____. "Their Eyes on the Past." *Washington Post*, August 22, 1937, B7.

_____. *Conspiracy and the Spanish Civil War: The Brainwashing of Francisco Franco*. London: Routledge/Cañada Blanch, 2002.

_____. *El lavado de cerebro de Francisco Franco. Conspiración y Guerra Civil*. Barcelona: Crítica, 2000.

_____. *Guernica! Guernica! A Study of Journalism, Diplomacy, Propaganda, and History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977. Also published as *La destruction de Guernica: journalisme, diplomatie, propagande et histoire*. Paris: Ruedo Ibérico, 1975; and *La destrucción de Guernica. Periodismo, diplomacia, propaganda e historia*. Paris: Ruedo Ibérico, 1977.

_____. "La destruction de Guernica, 26 avril 1937. Étude historique sur le journalisme, la diplomatie et la propagande." Doctoral diss., University of the Sorbonne, Paris, 1975.

_____. *El mito de la cruzada de Franco*. Paris: Ruedo Ibérico, 1963.

Spell, J. R. "Spanish Teaching in the United States." *Hispania* 10, no. 1 (1927): 141–59.

Stimson, Frederick S. "Present Status of Studies in North American Hispanism." *Hispania* 40, no. 4 (1957): 440–43.

_____. "The Beginning of American Hispanism, 1770–1830." *Hispania* 37, no. 4 (1954): 482–89.

_____. *Orígenes del hispanismo norteamericano*. México, D. F.: Librería Studium, 1961.

Styer, Dan. Comment no. 3 to "Politics by Another Name," by Stanley Fish. *New York Times*, May 2, 2006. <http://fish.blogs.nytimes.com/?p=13#comments>. Accessed May 24, 2006.

Sweeney, Mary Stedman. "A Report on Spain Today." *Hispania* 32, no. 2 (1949): 233–35.

Taylor, F. Jay. *The United States and the Spanish Civil War*, 1956. Reprint, New York: Octagon, 1971.

Thomas, Hugh. "Heinkels over Guernica." *Times Literary Supplement*, April 11, 1975: 392–93.

_____. *The Spanish Civil War*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1961.

Tierney, Dominic F. *FDR and the Spanish Civil War: Neutrality and Commitment in the Struggle that Divided America*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2007.

Trend, J. B. "Spanish Literature." Letter to the editor. *Times Educational Supplement*, November 16, 1951, 896.

_____. "The Serious Study of Spain." *The Cambridge Review* 64 (1942–43): 296–97.

———. *A Picture of Modern Spain: Men & Music*. London: Constable, 1921.

———. *Mexico: A New Spain with Old Friends*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940.

———. *The Civilization of Spain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1944.

———. *The Origins of Modern Spain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934.

Truscott, Bruce [E. Allison Peers]. *First Year at the University: A Freshman's Guide*. London: Faber and Faber, 1946.

———. *Red Brick University*. London: Faber and Faber, 1943.

———. *Redbrick and These Vital Days*. London: Faber and Faber, 1945.

Tusell, Javier, and Genoveva García Queipo de Llano. *El catolicismo mundial y la guerra de España*. Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1993.

“The Twentieth Annual Meeting,” *Hispania* 20, no. 1 (1937): 9–18.

“The Twenty-First Annual Meeting.” *Hispania* 21, no. 1 (1938): 1–12,

“The Twenty-Second Annual Meeting,” *Hispania* 22, no. 1 (1939): 8–18.

Ucelay da Cal, Enric. “Ideas preconcebidas y estereotipos en la guerra civil española.” *Historia social* 6 (1990): 23–43.

———. “The Hispanic Studies ‘Ghetto.’” *Bulletin of The Society for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies*, Fall 1994, 11–15.

Ullman, Joan Connelly. “Spanish History in the American University.” *Bulletin of The Society for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies*, October 1983, 10–21.

United States Congress. House Special Committee on Un-American Activities. *Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities in the United States. Hearings before a Special Committee on Un-American Activities*. 75th Congress. Third Session on H.Res 282. Vol. 1 and 2. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1938.

———. *Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities in the United States. Hearings before a Special Committee on Un-American Activities*. 76th Congress. First Session on H. Res. 282. Vol. 10. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1940.

Vidal, César. “Opositor americano de Franco. Obituario Herbert Southworth.” *El Mundo*, November 22, 1999. <http://www.elmundo.es/1999/11/22/opinion/22N0034.html>.

Vilar, Pierre. Foreword to *Guernica! Guernica! A Study of Journalism, Diplomacy, Propaganda, and History*, by Herbert R. Southworth, ix–xvii. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.

Wardropper, Bruce W. Review of *A Short History of the Romantic Movement in Spain*, by E. Allison Peers. *Modern Language Notes* 66, no. 8 (1951): 560–62.

Washington Post, “Scientists Plead for US to Lift Spain Embargo,” April 28, 1938.

Washington Post, “Democracy Lies with Franco, Says Dr. Code,” May 12, 1938.

Wigg, Richard. “Andalusia's Favourite Author Goes Home.” *London Times*, June 21, 1984, 6.

Wilkins, Lawrence E. “Spanish as a Substitute for German for Training and Culture.” *Hispania* 1, no. 4 (1918): 205–21.

———. “The President's Address.” *Hispania* 2, no. 1 (1919): 36–40.

———. “The President’s Address.” *Hispania* 4, no. 1 (1921): 28–34.

Williams, Jeffrey. “The Romance of the Intellectual and the Question of Profession.” In *Education and Cultural Studies: Toward a Performative Practice*, edited by H. A. Giroux and P. Shannon, 49–64. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Williams, Michael. “Spain’s Sacrifice.” *Commonweal*, May 14, 1937, 71–72.

———. “The Truth about Spain: Open Letter to the Press, No. 2.” Editorial. *Commonweal*, May 21, 1937, 85–87.

———. “The Truth about Spain: Open Letter to the Press, No. 4.” Editorial. *Commonweal*, June 4, 1937, 151–53.

Wilson, Elizabeth A. “A Short History of a Border War: Social Science, School Reform, and the Study of Literature.” In *Disciplining English: Alternative Histories, Critical Perspectives*, edited by David R. Shumway and Craig Dionne, 59–82. Albany: SUNY, 2002.

Wittke, Carl. Letter to the editor. *Oberlin Review*, January 18, 1938, 2.

INDEX

Abraham Lincoln Brigade, 231. *See also* Spanish Civil War, international volunteers

academic disciplines. *See* disciplinarity

academic freedom, 35, 39–40

Adams, Nicholson B., 43, 53, 230, 231

Agnew, Spiro T., 118

Aguirre, José Antonio de, 77

Alcalá Galiano, Antonio, 193

Alcázar of Toledo, 50–51, 76–77, 80, 236

Alfonso XIII, King, 133

Allen, Jay, 77, 156, 235

Ávarez Junco, José, 28–29, 227, 229

amateur scholars, 42, 48, 55–56, 95, 180, 219–20, 223–24

American Association of Teachers of Spanish (AATS), 22–23, 46–47, 57–60, 61, 191, 222, 230, 231, 232

American Association of University Professors (AAUP), 35, 40, 229

American Committee for Spanish Relief, 44, 125–28, 240

American Council on Education, 39

American Hispanism. *See* Hispanism, U.S.

American Historical Association (AHA), 232

American Historical Review, 235

American League against War and Fascism, 45, 95, 102, 108, 119, 237, 239

American League for Peace and Democracy. *See* American League against War and Fascism

American Student Union (ASU), 110–11, 115, 238

Amner, F. Dewey, 22–23, 228

Anrep, Helen, 158

anticommunism, 12, 34–35, 58, 62, 66, 68, 71, 77, 85, 127. *See also* House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC)

Aragón, Andrés. *See* Rubia Barcia, José

Artigas Ferrando, Miguel, 10, 227

Association of Hispanists of Great Britain and Ireland (AHGBI), 191

Athenaeum, 194

Atholl, Duchess of, 119

Atkinson, William C., 11, 190, 193, 194, 197–98, 219, 242, 246, 247

Azaña, Manuel, 105, 134, 143, 146

Azcárate, Pablo de, 246

Balfour, Sebastian, 209, 242, 247

Barbusse, Henri, 237

Basch, Victor, 119

Bates, Ralph, 53, 160, 243

Beaton, George. *See* Brenan, Gerald

Bécquer, Gustavo Adolfo, 113, 239

Bedoyere, Michael de la, 242

Benardete, Maír José, 53, 231

Besteiro, Julián, 151

Birmingham Post, The, 137

Blackfriars, 199

Black Legend, 7–8, 27–28, 93, 161, 243

Boletín bibliográfico, 223–24

Bolloten, Burnett, 75, 89–90, 236

Borges, Jorge Luis, 233–34

Borkenau, Franz, 75, 245

Borrow, George, 191, 212

Bourdieu, Pierre, 13

Bowers, Claude, 177

Brenan, Gerald, viii–ix, 7, 16, 21, 94, 107, 155–82, 190, 194, 207, 208, 219, 223, 228, 243–45; as amateur scholar, 180; on anarchism, 163–64; in British Hispanism, 159–61;

Brenan, Gerald—*continued*
 and discipline, 159, 166; and
 Francoism, 160, 167–75, 177,
 181–82; as George Beaton, 156–57,
 243; as Hispanophile, 159, 163–66,
 176, 178–80; in *The Manchester
 Guardian*, 157–58; and monarchism,
 171; as pro-Loyalist activist, 155,
 158–59, 168, 244; on Spanish
 national character, 161–63, 173–76,
 244; youth and education, 165;
 works: *Face of Spain*, 171–75, 244;
Literature of the Spanish People,
 169–70, 176, 244; *Personal Record*,
 181–82; *South From Granada*,
 178–79, 245; *Spanish Labyrinth*, 16,
 155, 157, 159, 160–67, 169, 171,
 174, 175, 176–77

Brenan, Helen, 165

Brenan, Hugh, 165

British Hispanism. *See* Hispanism, British

Brotherston, Gordon, 192

Brown, Gordon, 62, 233

Brown, Rica, 197

Bulletin of Hispanic Studies. *See* *Bulletin
 of Spanish Studies*

Bulletin of Spanish Studies, 130–32, 135,
 150, 153, 185, 188, 192

Buñuel, Luis, 233, 234

Burnshaw, Stanley, 113, 188, 239, 240

Buruma, Ian, 25–27, 228, 229

Bush, George W., 26

Cabritès, Pierre, 127

Calvo Serer, Rafael, 79–81, 86, 89

Calvo Sotelo, José, 50

Cambó, Francesc, 140, 242

Cambridge Journal, *The*, 204

Camino Galicia, León Felipe. *See* Felipe,
 León

Campbell, Roy, 89

Cárdenas, Lázaro, 38, 116

Carr, Raymond, 83, 166, 181, 190, 208,
 235, 243–44, 247, 91; and
 Hispanophilia, 209, 210; *Spain,
 1808–1939*, 208–9; and Spanish
 national character, 209; youth and
 education, 208

Casanova, Julián, 211

Case, Adelaide, 45

Castro, Américo, 69–72, 205, 233–34,
 245

Catholic Herald, *The*, 141, 151, 242

Cela, Camilo José, 228

Cenarro, Ángela, 211, 228–29, 243,
 246, 247, 248

Cernuda, Luis, 143

Cherrington, Ben, 61

Chesterton, G. K., 20, 148

Chomsky, Noam, 75, 222–23

Churchill, Winston, 234

Cierva, Ricardo de la, 90–92, 210–11,
 223, 247

Code, Joseph B., 45

Coester, Alfred, 46–47, 48, 49, 57, 120,
 231

Cold War, 65–72, 104, 116

*Comité international de coordination et
 d'information pour l'aide à l'Espagne
 républicaine*, 119–20

*Comité mondial de lutte contre la guerre
 et le fascisme*, 119

commitment, ix, 11, 12, 14, 24, 30, 41,
 42, 43, 45, 48, 190, 203, 210, 213;
 in E. Allison Peers, 142, 146, 148; in
 Gerald Brenan, 157, 159–60, 164,
 167, 168, 179; in Herbert R.
 Southworth, 86–89, 92, 95; in Paul
 P. Rogers, 98, 103, 108, 121

Committee for Spanish Relief. *See*
 American Committee for Spanish
 Relief

Commonweal, *The*, 125–27, 129, 133,
 139, 240

Communist Party of the United States
 (CPUSA), 237

Companys, Lluís, 151

Contemporary Review, *The*, 136

Cordoba, Pedro de, 127

Coughlin, Rev. Charles, 127

culture wars, 35

Curran, Rev. Edward Lodge, 127, 139,
 240

Current, Richard N., 239

Current Affairs, 169

Cuthbertson, Stuart, 50–52, 53,
 120, 231

Daily Telegraph, The, 136
 De los Ríos, Fernando, 85
 Dies, Martin, 115, 109–12. *See also*
 House Un-American Activities
 Committee (HUAC)
 Dies Committee. *See* House Un-
 American Activities Committee
 (HUAC)
 disciplinarity, 12–15, 35, 41, 47, 67, 88,
 145–49, 221, 230, 231
 Dos Passos, 53, 98, 237
 Douglas, Frances, 47
 Doyle, Henry Grattan, 36–40, 46, 47,
 59, 64, 120, 230
Dublin Review, The, 133, 139–40,
 142, 197
 Duff, Charles, 141–42, 151, 242

 Einstein, Albert, 3, 6
 Eisenhower, Dwight, 93
 Elliott, John H., 208, 211–12, 248
Encounter, 245
 Entwistle, William, 11, 190, 193–96,
 246
España Libre, 234
 Espinosa, Aurelio, Jr., 231
 Espinosa, Aurelio, Sr., 49–50, 52, 53,
 120, 231
 Estelrich i Artigues, Joan, 140

Falange Española, 65, 81–83, 150, 170,
 173, 203, 216, 235
 Falla, Manuel de, 194
 Faulkner, William, 100
 Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI),
 15, 115, 117–18
 Felipe, León, 100, 113, 118, 237, 239,
 240
 Fife, Robert Herndon, 23, 228
Fight, 101, 103, 107
 Fish, Stanley, 33, 40–42, 46, 47, 88, 230
 Fitz-Gerald, John, 59
 Fitzmaurice-Kelly, James, 193–94, 241
 Fleming, Ian, 33
 Ford, Richard, 20–21, 191, 212
 Ford, J. D. M., 57
Forthrightly, The, 197, 198
For Whom the Bell Tolls. *See* Hemingway,
 Ernest; Jordan, Robert

 Foucault, Michel, 13
 Franco, Jean, 192
 Franco Bahamonde, Francisco. *See*
 Francoism
 Francoism, 4, 45, 60, 65, 71, 80, 84–85,
 93; and A. A. Parker, 189, 200–201,
 203–7; and British Hispanism, 189,
 191, 220; and E. Allison Peers,
 139–53; and Gerald Brenan, 160,
 167–75, 177, 181–82; and
 representation of the Spanish Civil
 War, 79; and U.S. Hispanism, 48,
 60–65, 220, 222, 231
 Frank, Waldo, 27, 53, 98, 171, 229

 Gallagher, Leo, 238
 Gannon, Rev. Robert, 45
 García Lorca, Federico, 89, 116, 170,
 194, 195
 García Venero, Maximiano, 81–82
 Gautier, Théophile, 21
 Geiser, Carl, 238
 Geiser, Karl, 112
 Gellhorn, Martha, 98
 German language teaching, 22–23,
 36–37, 58, 60, 222
 Gibson, Ian, 94, 243, 244
 Giner de los Ríos, Francisco, 146
 Glick, Thomas A., 91
 González Llubera, Ignacio, 198
 Good Neighbor Policy, 58, 62, 222
 Goytisolo, Juan, 234
 Graham, Helen, 186, 209
 Grant, Helen F., 190, 197, 206–7, 246
 Gray, Herman A., 45
 Greene, Graham, 148
 Grimley, Rev. Bernard, 127, 139
 Guernica, 81, 83–84, 92–93, 94,
 125, 248

 Hammond, Ogden, 126
 Harris, Basil, 126, 127
 Hart, D. Jeffrey, 83
 Hart, Stephen, 187, 245
 Havens, George, 37–38, 230
 Hayes, Cardinal Patrick, 126
 Hayes, Carlton, 75
 Hedilla, Manuel, 81–82

Hemingway, Ernest, 17–18, 20, 23–24, 30, 53, 98, 228. *See also* Jordan, Robert

Hespelt, Herman, 22, 60, 228, 232

Hilton, Ronald, 49–50

Hispania, 10–11, 46–47, 50, 53, 58, 61, 62–65, 230

Hispanic Council (British), 130, 152

Hispanic Review, 48

Hispanism: and amateur scholars, 8, 48, 219–20, 223–24; definitions of, 9, 55–56, 228, 229; and disciplinarity, 15, 47, 221; and economics, 24; and Hispanophilia, 17–30; as historiography, 28–29; as ideology, 19, 28–29, 68–72, 185–86, 220, 222; institutional history, 11, 27–30; and Latin America, 19, 56–57; and Orientalism, 24–25; and philology, 55; and professionalization, 30. *See also* Hispanism, British; Hispanism, United States

Hispanism, British, 183–213; and professionalization, 220; and Francoism, 189, 191, 220, 231; and Hispanophilia, 221–22; and historiography, 190–91, 192, 207–13, 223; history, 191–94; and Latin Americanism, 191–92, 220–21; and professionalization, 203; and Spanish Civil War, 217–25

Hispanism, U.S., 33–72; and amateurs, 55–56, 95; and the Cold War, 65–72, 104; and Francoism, 48, 60–65, 220, 222; and Hispanophilia, 221–22; and historiography, 71–72, 223; history, 56–57; and Latin Americanism, 55–60, 66, 220–21, 228–29; and liberalism, 65–72, 220; and Pan-Americanism, 57, 58–59, 61–62, 219, 222; and professionalization, 220; and Spanish Civil War, 36–54, 217–25; and Spanish Civil War exile, 66–72, 220

hispanismo, 9, 29, 68, 71, 229, 233. *See also* Hispanism

Hispanophilia, 7–9, 17–30, 218, 221–22; in Allison Peers, 126, 131, 132, 138–39, 142–46; in Gerald Brenan, 159, 163–66, 176, 178–80; in Herbert Southworth, 92–94; as nationalism, 19–21; and nostalgia, 148–49; and origins of Hispanism, 21; in Paul Rogers, 107–9; in Raymond Carr, 209; and scholarly knowledge, 18–19, 21; in United States, 27–28

Hitler, Adolf, 38–39, 62, 112, 105, 216, 238

Hobsbawm, Eric J., 12

Hoover, Herbert, 109

Hoover, J. Edgar, 117

Horowitz, David, 33–34, 40–42, 46, 47, 88, 109, 113, 229

House Special Committee on Un-American Activities. *See* House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC)

House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC), 34–35, 109–12, 115, 234, 238–39

Hughes, Langston, 97, 106, 237

Humanities Research Association (Britain), 131

Humphries, Rolfe, 53

Huntington, Archer, 193

Ibárruri, Dolores, 105–6

ideology and Hispanism. *See* Hispanism: ideology

Ilie, Paul, 222–23

Inman, Samuel Guy, 45

Institutionality, 13, 67

Instituto Internacional de Literatura Iberoamericana (IILI), 57–58

intellectuals: as amateurs, 42; and political commitment, 5–6, 11–12; and Spanish Civil War, 5–6

Irving, Washington, 20–21, 56, 61

Irwin, Robert, 25, 230

Ivens, Joris, 111

Jackson, Gabriel, 72, 75, 83, 94, 180, 223, 235, 243

Jerrold, Douglas, 224

Johnson, Lyndon, 234

Jordan, Barry, 183, 186–87, 190, 245
Jordan, Robert, 17–18, 20, 23–24, 98, 103, 237. *See also* Hemingway, Ernest
Juderías, Julián, 228
Junta Central del Tesoro Artístico, 10

Kamen, Henry, 208
Kerrey, Bob, 41
Knoblaugh, Edward, 126

Labanyi, Jo, 186
Lacasa, Luis, 105
Langdon-Davies, John, 76, 175
language teaching: and patriotism, 22–23, 37; and politics, 37–40; and Spanish Civil War, 36–40; and World War II, 36–40
Lapuente, Felipe-Antonio, 239
Largo Caballero, Francisco, 167
Larrea, Juan, 105
Latin Americanism, 232, 234; and British Hispanism, 191–92, 220–21; and U.S. Hispanism, 55–60, 66, 220–21, 228–29
Latin American Studies. *See* Latin Americanism
Latin American Studies Association (LASA), 232
Latinophilia, 19. *See also* Hispanophilia
Leavis, F. R., 145
Lee, Gypsy Rose, 112
Lewis, Bernard, 25–27, 43, 100, 229
Lewis, Sinclair, 100
Leyenda negra. *See* Black Legend
liberalism and American Hispanism, 65–72, 220
Lida, Clara E., 92
Listener, The, 195
Liverpool Daily Post, The, 136
Longfellow, Henry W., 20–21, 56
Lope de Vega, 107
Lowell, James R., 21, 56
Lull, Ramon, 131, 146, 152
Lunn, Arnold, 148

Macaulay, Rose, 175
MacEachron, Paul, Jr., 111, 238

Machado, Antonio, 113, 143
MacNeill-Moss, Major Geoffrey, 76–77
Madariaga, Salvador de, 5, 104, 198, 247
Maeztu, Ramiro de, 62
Malefakis, Edward, 72
Manchester Guardian, *The*, 156–57, 243
Manning, Warren, 63–64, 233
Marañón, Gregorio, 5
Marías, Javier, 197, 246
Marrero, Vicente, 79–81, 86, 89, 93
Marsh, Maurine, 61
Martínez, 235
Martínez Guerricabeitia, José, 82–84, 90–91, 94, 181
Mason, Noah, 109, 112
Mateos, Abdón, 211
Matthews, Herbert, 65, 75, 87, 233, 236
Maury, Suzanne, 77
McCarthy, Sen. Joseph, 34–35, 109, 229. *See also* anticommunism; House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC)
Menéndez Pidal, Ramón, 64, 205, 231, 233
Menken, Mrs. S. Stanwood, 127–28
Merriman, Robert, 45, 237
Miaja, José, 106
Modern Language Association (MLA), 23, 40, 230, 232
Modern Language Journal, 36–40, 48–49, 230
Modern Language Notes, 48, 152
Modern Language Quarterly, 48
Mola, Gen. Emilio, 143
Monroe doctrine, 58
Moradiellos, Enrique, 211, 228, 242, 243, 244, 246, 247
Mosier, Harold, 109, 112
Murphy, James, 41
Mussolini, Benito, 20, 62, 38–39, 106, 238

National Federation of Modern Language Teachers, 230
nationalism, 19–21
Navarro Tomás, Tomás, 10, 227

Negrín, Juan, 105
 New Criticism, 67–68
New Statesman and Nation, 156, 168, 243, 244
 Niebuhr, Reinhold, 45
Nineteenth Century and After, 3, 5, 197, 198
 Nixon, Richard, 118
 nonintervention, 62, 195, 227
 North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, 102, 105, 119, 238
 Oberlin College, 15, 99–102, 109–12
 objectivity, 35, 75, 85–89, 210, 218–19, 227; in E. Allison Peers, 137, 139, 142; and Hispanism, 28; and politics, 15; and scholarship, 15
Occident, 140
 Office for Strategic Services (OSS), 77
 Office of War Information (OWI), 77, 234
 Ohmann, Richard, 67–68, 69, 233
 Onís, Federico de, 100
 orientalism, 9, 230
 Ortega y Gasset, José, 3, 5–6, 43, 104, 220, 227
 Orwell, George, 19–20, 75, 228
 otherness, ix–x, 9, 25, 144, 165
 Oxford Pledge, 12, 110, 238
 Pan-Americanism, 48, 57, 58–59, 61–62, 117, 219, 222, 232
 Pan-Hispanism. *See* hispanismo
 Paris, Gaston, 59
 Parker, Alexander A., 11, 185, 186, 188–89, 190, 191, 194, 196, 208, 209, 219, 220, 222, 223, 225, 247; *Allegorical Drama of Calderón, The*, 201; on Carlism, 200; and Francoism, 189, 200–201, 203–7; as Hispanophile, 202; as militant Catholic publicist, 198–200; and morality, 202–3; on Second Spanish Republic, 199–200; as traditionalist, 189; youth and education, 198
 Parry Report, 191
 Partridge, Ralph, 158, 167, 170
 Pasionaria. *See* Ibárruri, Dolores
 Pass, Joseph, 108
 Pattee, Richard F., 59, 232
 Payne, Stanley G., 91, 180, 235
 Peers, E. Allison, viii–ix, 7, 11, 16, 107, 125–53, 193–96, 185, 188, 190, 191, 192, 193–96, 200, 206, 209, 219, 220, 225, 240–42; and American Catholicism, 128–29; as Bruce Truscott, 246; and Catalonia, 133, 137–38; and Catholic media, 132–33; and discipline, 145–49; and faith, 145–49; and Francoism, 139–53; on Gerald Brenan, 160–61, 169; as Hispanophile, 126, 131, 132, 138–39, 142–46; at Liverpool, 130; in New York, 126–29; and objectivity, 137, 139, 142; and order, 135–36, 145–49; as publicist, 131–53; on Second Republic, 133–36, 146–47; in *The Commonweal*, 129; youth and education, 129–30; works: *Catalonia Infeliz*, 141; *Granada*, 131; *Our Debt to Spain*, 142–43; *Royal Seville*, 131, 144–45; *Spain in Eclipse*, 151; *The Church in Spain, 1739–1937*, 142; *The Spanish Dilemma*, 129, 150; *The Spanish Tragedy*, 134–36, 138–39, 142
 Peninsular War, 24
 Pérez Galdós, Benito, 113, 239
 Peters, Mary Eleanor, 61
 philias, 18–20, 148. *See also* Hispanophilia
 philology, 55, 71, 232
 Picasso, Pablo, 105
 Pierce, Frank, 198
 Pike, David Wingeate, 236
 Prescott, William H., 20–21
 Preston, 16, 180, 208, 213, 215, 235, 237, 247, 248
 Primo de Rivera, José Antonio, 244
 Primo de Rivera, Miguel, 133
 Primo de Rivera, Miguel, Jr., 244
 Pritchett, V. S., 158, 175
Publications of the Modern Language Association (PMLA), 48

Queipo de Llano, General Gonzalo, 157

Ramos Oliveira, Antonio, 242

Read, Malcolm K., 145, 147, 185–86, 186–89, 190, 198, 242, 245, 246

Reagan, Ronald, 118

Reid, John T., 53, 231

Revista Hispánica Moderna, 49

Revista Iberoamericana, 58, 233

Ribbans, Geoffrey, 241, 242, 245

Richards, Michael, 209

rigor. *See* disciplinarity; objectivity

Ríos, Fernando de los, 76

Robeson, Paul, 98

Robles Pazos, José, 237

Rockefeller, Nelson, 61

Rogers, Douglass, 101, 237, 239

Rogers, F. Theo, 76

Rogers, Patrick Simpson, 99

Rogers, Paul Patrick, viii–ix, 7, 15–16, 95, 97–121, 224, 237–40; and anticomunism, 109–12, 115, 117; and the Cold War, 116; and the FBI, 117–18; as Hispanophile, 107–9; in Mexico, 116, 239; and Pan-Americanism, 117; in Paris, 104–5, 119–20; political evolution, 99–121; and populism, 101; scholarship and politics, 113–14; silence on Spanish Civil War, 115; in Spain, 105–9, 120; on Spanish culture, 107–8; *Spanish for the First Year*, 117; in Texas, 118–19; and World War II, 116–17; youth and education, 99–100

Rolfe, Edwin, 98

Rolland, Romain, 119

Romanticism and Spain, 7

Romanic Review, 48

Roosevelt, Theodore D., 44, 45, 58, 59, 62, 101, 110

Rosenberg, S. L. Millard, 47

Round, Nicholas, 187–89, 198

Rowe, William, 192

Rowell, Chester, 39–40, 46, 230

Rubia Barcia, José (Andrés Aragón), 234

Ruedo Ibérico. *See* Martínez Guerricabeitia, José

Russell, Bertrand, 156–57

Russell, Peter E., 190, 196–97, 243, 246

Sacks, Norman P., 65, 233

Sagalyn, Arnold, 111

Said, Edward, 9, 227, 229, 230; critique of orientalism, 24–26; and intellectual legitimacy, 42; on scholarship and politics, 40–42; works: *Orientalism*, 24–27; *Representations of the Intellectual*, 42

Sender, Ramón J., 53, 231

Shelley, Mary, 33

Shotwell, James T., 45, 231

Shubert, Adrian, 28–29, 227, 229, 231, 243

Shumway, Nicolas, 28

Silverman, Joseph H., 233

Sinclair, Upton, 100

Sitwell, Sacheverell, 175

Smith, Paul Julian, 184, 186–87, 206, 245

Society for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies (SSPHS), 91–92, 232

Sontag, 4, 227

South Atlantic Modern Language Association, 63

Southworth, Herbert Rutledge, viii–ix, 7, 15–16, 73–95, 103, 107, 120–21, 167, 180, 216, 219, 223, 235–37, 247, 248; as amateur scholar, 95, 223–24; conception of truth, 85–86; as Hispanophile, 92–94; and objectivity, 85–89, 210; and political commitment, 86–87; vs. Hugh Thomas, 210–11, 224, 248; in *Washington Post*, 73–74, 76–77; youth and education, 74; works: *Antifalange*, 81–83; *Conspiracy and the Spanish Civil War*, 84–85; *Destruction de Guernica*, 83–84, 86; *El mito de la cruzada de Franco*, 79–81, 83, 84, 87, 93, 223–24

Spain: American interest in, 24; British interest in, 24; images of, 7–8; as other, 25–29

Spanish Civil War: and Britain, 159, 161, 218; and British Hispanism, 217–25;

Spanish Civil War—*continued*
 and Catholic opinion, 125–28, 132, 241, 152; cultural impact, 4; as discursive battle, 215–17; international volunteers, 12, 44, 98, 111, 231, 238; narrative framework, 4–5, 161, 215–17; newspaper coverage, 43, 87–88; and nonintervention, 44, 62, 195, 227; and propaganda, 6, 10, 44, 63, 76, 80, 85, 86, 90–91, 172; and public sphere legitimacy, 43, 216–17; representations of, 4–5, 161, 215–17; and teachers of Spanish, 36, 38–39; and United States, 38–39, 44–45, 218, 230, 238; and U.S. foreign policy, 43–44; and U.S. Hispanism, 36–54, 217–25

Spanish Civil War exile, 78, 116; and American Hispanism, 66–72

Spanish Relief Committee, 52

specialization. *See* disciplinarity

Spectator, The, 168

Stalin, Jozef, 38–39, 115

Starkie, Walter, 196

Steinbeck, John, 100

Stone, Victor, 239

Studies, 133, 149

Sturges, Wesley A., 45

Sweeney, Mary, 64–65, 233

Tablet, The, 133, 137

Temple, Shirley, 111

Thatcher, Margaret, 183

Thomas, Hugh, 78–79, 87, 180, 181, 208, 210–11, 224, 248

Thomas, Norman, 110

Thorning, Joseph B., 45, 231

Thought, 142

Ticknor, George, 56

Times Literary Supplement, The, 83, 84, 90, 195, 224

Trend, John Brande, 11, 160, 190, 192, 193–96, 197, 206, 209, 243, 246

Truscott, Bruce (E. A. Peers), 147–48, 151. *See also* Peers, E. Allison

Tuchman, Barbara. *See* Wertheim, Barbara

Turton, Peter, 192

Ugarte, Eduardo, 105

Universe, The, 133

Velázquez, Diego, 233

Vidal, César, 224, 248

Vilar, Pierre, 84, 86, 94, 180, 235, 236

Voz de Londres, 167

Ward, Harry, 45

Wardropper, Bruce, 152, 242

Waugh, Evelyn, 148

Welles, Sumner, 59

Wells, H. G., 100

Wertheim, Barbara, 77

White, Hayden, 236

Wilkins, Ernest Hatch, 104, 110–11

Wilkins, Lawrence, 22, 60, 222, 228

Williams, Michael, 125–27, 127, 129, 240

Wilson, E. M., 190, 196, 198

Wittke, Carl, 111

Woodlock, Thomas F., 126

Woolsey, Gamel, 155, 158, 171, 177

World Committee Against War and Fascism, 237

World Congress Against War and Fascism, 237

World War I and language teaching, 22–23, 36